Info. Dev.
[illegible]
c.3

PROGRAM EVALUATION

ÉVALUATION des PROGRAMMES

Canada

AN EVALUATION OF KATIMAVIK:

EFFECTIVENESS RELATED

TO COST

a report presented to

The Evaluation Directorate
Secretary of State

by

Terrence B. Peace, Ph.D.
Applied Sciences Corporation
504 Davie Street
Vancouver, B.C.

23 October, 1981

This study was paid for by the Secretary of State Department. Results and opinions contained therein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views or the intentions of the Secretary of State Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary 1
Introduction 2
Research Objectives 6
Participants' Benefits and Costs 7
Communities' Benefits and Costs 18
Government of Canada Benefits and Costs 26
To Rent or to Buy 34
Operation to Capacity 36
Economies of Scale 43
Policy Analysis 46

LIST OF TABLES

Language Benefits (comprehension) 10

Instruction Required 11

Language Benefits (idioms) 12

Participants' Benefits and Costs 17

Value of Physical Improvements 20

Communities' Benefits and Costs 25

Government of Canada Benefits and Costs 31

Global Benefits and Costs 32

Participants and Staff 37

Projects, Staff and Budget 44

ERRATA

Page 53, line 5. "average 3.5 months" should read "average 7 months"

Page 56, line 13. "$61.15" should read "$30.57"

Page 56, line 14. "$10.95" should read "$5.47"

ASK

SUMMARY

Katimavik stands in a cost-benefit relation to three groups: the participants, the communities, and the Government of Canada. The first two have large net benefits from the program, while the Government of Canada bears most of the costs. We find that the Government of Canada also reaps considerable benefits from Katimavik, but that these benefits could be much greater.

Two large items which are now rented could be bought: vans and computer hardware. Both of these policies are currently under review, independent of our study. Other areas of inefficiency are excessive concern with accounting and information gathering, at the expense of program development. Further, an ill-considered, exploitive policy towards the field staff is wasting money and human resources.

Economies of scale may be reaped by remedying the above problem areas; the program should become much more effective for a small increase in expenditures. Moreover, these expenditures will require no increase in funding, as OPCAN routinely returns large ammounts of money to the funding agency, Secretary of State.

INTRODUCTION

Katimavik is a program for young Canadian volunteers aged 17 to 21. Participants are recruited in a national campaign, by means of advertisements and posters. These volunteers are selected by a random process, so that several demographic variables of the Canadian population are reflected in each Katimavik group of 33 participants.

The 33 participants are sent to a rural community where they engage in community service work; they either make a physical improvement to the community, or provide social services. The type of service is determined by of the host community, via a sponsor, who is chosen on the basis of a written proposal. Work projects are designed by local sponsors who are aided by the Katimavik national and regional staffs, and are supported by them should problems arise. In the Katimavik literature, these community services are advertised as often being of an environmental nature.

The 33 participants, then, are a team which may cooperate on one large project, or fragment into many smaller work teams; the project as a whole is supervised by a coordinator. Each group of 33 is broken into three subgroups of 11 each; the subgroups live together, eat together, and perform domestic chores together, each under the supervision of a group leader.

After three months on one project, the whole group of 33 participants moves on to a new site in a different part of Canada. Three such projects comprise the Katimavik experience: two anglophone projects, and one francophone project. One of these projects may, at the participant's option, be at a military base. At the end of nine months in the program, the participants are sent home with a $1000 honorarium and a new set of experiences. These experiences are expected to encompass most of the major objectives of Katimavik.

The project sites are clustered into groups of three, called rotations; the 99 participants in a rotation may thus visit the three sites at Barrhead, Alberta; Beauce, Quebec; and Charlo, New Brunswick; in three trimesters. Confusion sometimes arises because the first site visited by a participant is referred to as his first rotation, the second and third sites as his second and third rotations. Thus "rotation" may refer to a group of three sites, or to one of the three trimesters. The context will make our usage clear.

Volunteer service is not easily sustained for nine months, especially by young people who have only recently completed high school. Powerful incentives must be offerred: these incentives include the opportunity to see a different part of the country and to be part of a group. As members of a Katimavik group, the participants are part of a micro-

community which is totally committed to volunteer work. This provides the necessary support to continue, in most cases. It also constrains the participants to work together to solve the daily problems of living, exacerbated as they are by the linguistic and cultural diversity of the participants, the lean living conditions, and the unfamiliar character of the host community. In this way, three of Katimavik's four main goals are to be achieved implicitly:

. personal development;

. environmental awareness;

. increased knowledge and understanding of Canada.

The fourth goal, service to the community, is to be achieved explicitly.

Katimavik has three layers of management: the five regional offices, the National Office, and the Board of Directors. A regional office has three main functions: management (Regional Director and Assistant Director), finance (Budget Comptroller), and project support (Regional Animator and Reserve Group Leader). A secretary makes the complement of a regional office six, except in Quebec, where the large number of projects necessitates two additional staff. The national office has seven functions: administration (three people), finance (four people), communications (one person), personnel (one person), logistics (one person), project support (three people), and translation (one person). Twelve secretaries and clerks make 26 full time positions in the

national office; there are, in addition, numerous part time positions. The Board of Directors is staffed entirely by volunteers, and is, for administrative convenience, a separate corporation: OPCAN. The Secretary of State Department grants on the order of $12,000,000 to OPCAN yearly, and this money is used solely to fund Katimavik.

Such is the conception and structure of Katimavik. Its performance is the subject of this research.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research is designed to examine Katimavik's effectiveness with respect to cost. We address six questions:

1) benefits and costs to each party;
2) global benefits and costs;
3) renting vs buying policies;
4) the extent to which Katimavik is operating at capacity;
5) economies of scale;
6) Katimavik compared to related programs.

We have used two main sources of information: that obtained in our effectiveness study, and that provided by Katimavik in response to our requests. We also contacted many other people and programs for smaller pieces of information.

PARTICIPANTS' BENEFITS

Personal Development. Personal growth is a considerable benefit to the young people involved in Katimavik. We found two main areas of personal development: commitment to the volunteer ideal, and increased communications skills (see effectiveness report). Unfortunately, these dimensions are two of the many aspects of psychology not addressed by economics, and so we cannot readily assign a dollar value to this benefit.

Knowledge and Understanding. Katimavik provides the participants with access to a diversity of new information about our country. Participants are sent to small towns; for many, this is in itself rather novel. Participants are housed with people who (at least initially) speak only the other official language, who are from different regions, and who are from several socio-economic strata. Participants spend at least three months in a town whose people predominantly speak the other official language (three months in a francophone community, six months in anglophone communities). They are also exposed to three geographically different parts of Canada, and most report that they explore their temporary surroundings.

These experiences seem to have a positive effect. About 80% of participants, graduates, and dropout-dismissals indicate that Katimavik had made them more aware of Canada's problems, and made them more eager to solve them. While this information is only from self-report, we feel justified in asserting that most participants do acquire an increased knowledge and understanding of Canada (see effectiveness report). Again, it is impossible to put a dollar value on these very real benefits.

Second Language Learning. Knowledge of a language other than one's first language is widely seen as important; many academic institutions regard the skill so highly as to require it for some degree programs. One of Katimavik's secondary aims has been to increase second language competence amongst its participants. However, group leaders are not chosen for their abilities as teachers of a second language, nor for their fluency in their second language. Thus it is altogether too much to expect the participants to emerge, in a year's time, with high competence in the two offical languages.

The evaluators felt that about 90% of the participants had improved their language skills, but that this improvement was rarely equivalent to that offered by an extended immersion course. Results depended on the dedication of the individual; for example, a few participants commented that they joined

Katimavik to learn the other language, and their progress was spectacular: one acquired full competence from no previous knowledge.

We tested second language learning with a pair of matched French and English conversational tests (see the effectiveness study). Participants were ranked on eight dimensions of competence, and accorded scores of 1 (full competence) to 5 (no competence). As we were not able to administer before and after tests, nor even use a control group, one must make certain assumptions to make anything of the data. If we assume that anyone with a four year background or less (a high school language course is four years) has acquired his second language competence because of Katimavik, and that aural comprehension is the best indicator of the language skills Katimavik provides, we may calculate the second language benefits as follows.

We estimate that it takes about two university semesters to move students from one of the five levels of competence to another. Two university semesters are equivalent to about 100 hours of instruction, hence participants may have received benefits equivalent to 100, 200, 300, or 400 hours of instruction. We have assumed that each hour of instruction is worth $25 to each participant, a figure obtained from Berlitz School of Languages, and a figure agreeing with the costs of

providing an hour of French instruction at the University of Victoria.

Of the 189 participants tested, two were so fluently bilingual as to be unable to specify a first language, and 37 proved incapable of proceeding with the test. The remaining 150 received benefits according to the following table.

TABLE 1: Language Benefits (comprehension)

Level of Competence	Years of Previous Instruction									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9**
1	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	6	2
2	4	2	3	3	7	5	4	9	8	10
3	7	7	2	4	5	9	1	4	5	4
4	4	2	5	3	4	2	2	1	2	3
5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

*8 or more years of instruction

** previous instruction unknown

The value of these benefits was computed from the following matrix, indicating the number of hundreds of hours required to achieve these levels.

TABLE 2: Instruction Required (100's of hours)

Level of Competence	Years of Previous Instruction									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9**
1	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	0	4
2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	3
3	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*8 or more years of instruction

** previous instruction unknown

Note that the columns in the previous matrices refer to number of years of instruction, with two exceptions: column 8 refers to 8 or more years of instruction, and column 9 refers to cases for which this data was not available. We arbitrarily assumed that people for whom this data was not available had taken four or fewer years of the other official language.

By multiplying the entries in the first matrix by the entries in the second (equivalently, forming the dot product of the first matrix and the transpose of the second), we found language gains corresponding to 22,180 hours of instruction, valued at $554,500. We estimate the 66% confidence interval at $530,000 to $610,000.

These figures represent the value gained by 189 participants. To estimate the expected value obtained by an arbitrary participant, we need only divide the figures by 189. This yields an expected value of $2,930 per participant, with the 66% confidence interval being $2,800 to $3225.

The 290 dropouts and dismissals may also have learned something. As they are not included in the analysis, the figures obtained are conservative.

It might also be argued that a revealing measure of Katimavik's second language program is the mastery of idioms; certainly, this dimension showed one of the lower levels of achievement. Recalculating the benefits with the matrix corresponding to idiomatic mastery, we find benefits of between $2380 and $2775 per participant.

TABLE 3: Language Benefits (idioms)

Level of Competence	Years of Previous Instruction									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9**
1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	0
2	5	1	2	3	5	5	4	5	4	8
3	6	4	4	3	7	8	1	8	8	5
4	4	4	3	3	5	4	3	2	5	4
5	1	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	3

Note that these figures have been derived from a conceptually easy and mathematically trivial model: that linguistic competence is a linear function of hours of instruction and years of previous instruction. One could also make other assumptions, and obtain different figures. One alternative which springs to mind is based on distributions of competencies, as a function of hours of instruction and years of previous instruction. This model would allow us to consider such factors as different people deriving different levels of benefit from the same levels of instruction. Hence one would have a series of random variables corresponding to different periods of instruction, given certain beginning competencies. One might then form the minimal cost linear function of these random variables, which would approximate the known data distribution. We have not done this, for two reasons: expense, and ignorance of the 36 random variables required by the model. Thus any increased precision would be spurious.

Finally, we feel that our simple model provides a conservative estimate of the worth of language instruction; therefore, the figures are conservative on two counts.

Skills and Work Enhancement. Knowledge obtained in Katimavik may prove useful to the participants in their future employment or their avocations. Again, several methods of measurement are available: but self report constitutes the

only data obtained. Questions 7-9, 11, 36, and 37 of instrument B address this issue, as do comparable questions on instrument D; and our results indicate that some useful skills are indeed acquired.

Ninety-four per cent of participants felt that they had developed useful skills, three quarters had learned environmentally appropriate technologies, and three quarters of the graduates testified that they had learned something which would be useful when looking for a job. Our research design did not permit us to examine this question in detail, and so we can neither qualify nor quantify these developments. We also found that many stated a preference for working with people, and a few said that they would not accept boring or environmentally damaging employment; however, we cannot assert that Katimavik has developed these attitudes.

We may conclude that Katimavik encourages the development of useful skills in the participants. Yet these skills are of a rudimentary nature when compared to those developed during an apprenticehsip or four semesters at a technical college. It is again impossible to quantify the benefits in monetary terms.

PARTICIPANTS' COSTS

Lost Income. Katimavik participants are not in the work force for 9 months, and therefore suffer significant loss of income as a direct result of participation in Katimavik. We cannot determine whether the participants would have promptly begun training for a career (in which case their loss is not that of 9 months work in 1981, but the loss of the last 9 months of employment before their retirement; corrected for mortality, etc.), or whether Katimavik has helped them settle into a more appropriate niche more quickly than they would have otherwise done. That these factors cannot be predicted with certainty forces us to accept a much less precise estimate of their losses: minimum wage for 9 months, corrected for probability of unemployment.

As the unemployment rate from September 1980 to June 1981 was approximately 14.6% for people 15 to 24, and the federal minimum wage was $3.25, we may conclude that the minimum expected wage loss for a participant was .854 x 9 (months) x 22(days) x 8(hours) x $3.25 x 1.04 (holiday pay) - $1000 (honorarium) - $270 (pocket money) = $3300.

Expenses. Many participants spend more than the $1/day allowance, either by requesting money from home, or by begging cigarettes, etc. from wealthier participants or field staff. The $1 daily allowance was suggested in 1976. If we assume

that $1 /day was satisfactory then, and a 1981 dollar is worth only $.628 in 1976 dollars, we find a shortfall of $1/.628 - $1 = $.59 in the allowance, representing $159 /participant/year. This too is a cost to the participant.

In conclusion, many of the participant's benefits are intangible, while his costs are all too immediate. Nevertheless, we find that people are applying to Katimavik, and, once accepted into the program, are remaining. This suggests that, to most of the applicants, the benefits are at least as great as the costs.

TABLE 4: Participants' Benefits and Costs

	Immediate	Medium Term	Long Term
Benefits			
Personal Growth	benefits, no valuation	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Knowledge of Canada	benefits, no valuation	benefits, nv	benefits,nv
2nd Language	$2930	diminished (forgetting)	nil
Skills	benefits, nv	benefits, nv	benefits,nv
Costs			
Wage loss	$3300	nil	nil
Expenses	$159	nil	nil

Balance: Benefits at least as great as costs.

COMMUNITIES' BENEFITS

Physical Improvements. The most visible benefit to the community consists of the physical objects constructed by Katimavik. These vary widely; in some communities, Katimavik is mainly involved in providing social services, and so provides few physical improvements; while in others, Katimavik constructs log cabins, ski trails, and renovates old buildings.

We have been provided with a description of all the physical objects constructed by Katimavik in year IV, and with a description of most objects constructed in the previous three years. There are several methods of valuing these: we could hire professional estimators to judge the dollar worth of the work, obtain rough estimates from contractors over the telephone, or use algorithms based on available data.

The first, while by far the most reliable, is prohibitively expensive. The second is of very limited applicability because few contractors have experience with making ski trails in scrub bush country, etc. The last has the compelling advantage of universal applicability, even if it also suffers from the liability of considerable uncertainty. We present four estimates of capital improvement, based on data provided by Katimavik and its sponsors.

The first estimate of capital improvement is provided by the Katimavik sponsors. In all but the last year (IV), the data is incomplete. We have assumed that projects reported or failed to report at random, and so arrived at our estimate of total capital improvement by multiplying total reported improvements by the inverse of the fraction of projects reporting. This constituted method 1.

The second method of calculating capital improvement was the addition of the reported cost of materials to the value of labour contributed by Katimavik. The latter was calculated as $3.25 x 30 (hours/week) x number of reported man-weeks. Method 3 was based on an algorithm suggested by the Canadian Association of Architects (Ontario Chapter), for the building of houses: 2 x material costs. We expect this algorithm to provide an extremely conservative estimate of capital improvement, for two reasons: many projects note, but do not evaluate, donated materials; and housing is much more capital intensive than most of Katimavik's physical work projects. Method 4 was similar, in that we multiplied the "sponsors' contributions" by two. Missing data was treated as in method 1. Figures are reported in thousands of dollars.

TABLE 5: Value of Physical Improvements ($1000's)

	Method 1	Method 2	Method 3	Method 4
Year 1	$ 386	*	*	606
Year 2	938	*	*	1,139
Year 3	993	*	*	1,044
Year 4	1,266	1,319	733	*

*data is not available for these estimates

Cash Infusion. In addition to the physical improvements rendered by the work projects, there is the substantial infusion of cash into the local economy: money for food, gasoline, van rental, etc. The total monies spent on the sites in 1980-81 was about $5,000,000, or $165,000 per site.

Recruitment. Another potential benefit to the community is the occasional hiring of a Katimavik graduate in the community. This is clearly of little benefit when the graduate takes an unskilled job, as small towns are usually replete with unskilled labour. But if a skilled or semi-professional job is filled, the community will have saved the cost of recruiting this person. We estimated the value of this by surveying both citizens and community leaders in the various towns in which Katimavik has been active, asking them how many Katimavik participants had stayed in the community to accept employment. Of the 101 communities whose citizens or

leaders responded, two claimed to know of a total of two Katimavik participants who had taken skilled or semi-professional jobs in their communities. We may therefore infer that the ammount of money saved by communities in job recruitment is negligable.

Knowledge and Understanding. The citizens of the communities may also obtain a greater understanding of Canada, its diversity, and its cultures through Katimavik. The only measure used in this evaluation was self-report: we asked the citizens and community leaders if they had become more aware of Canada because of Katimavik. As 31% of the citizens and 39% of the leaders said that they had become more aware because of Katimavik, we may conclude that the benefits are considerable, though unquantifiable.

Community Image. The community may also benefit from a better image. The main purveyors of this benefit will be the participants who enjoyed their stay and learned to love another part of Canada. We obtained data on this question by asking the graduates precisely that: "How do you like the communities you worked in?" We found that more than 80% of the graduates responding had positive feelings about the host communities. While this benefit cannot be assessed in terms of dollars, it is nonetheless important, and could lead to substantial economic benefits in the future (e.g. tourism).

Social Services. Katimavik typically expends 25% of its efforts in providing social services to its host communities. These too vary widely: reading to the blind, caring for the aged, teaching the mentally retarded, etc. Many of the citizens and leaders volunteered that these social services were appreciated both by the recipients and the community at large. Again, we did not feel confident in assigning a dollar value to this benefit for two reasons: it is impossible to equate the service provided by an untrained volunteer to the service provided by a trained professional, and it is impossible to evaluate the "need" for such services in a market context. Therefore, we feel that it is inappropriate to assess this very real benefit in monetary terms.

COMMUNITIES' COSTS

Foregone Opportunities. Against any gains from Katimavik must be set the cost of forgoing other government programs (because of governmental policy or limited resources). While it is impossible to determine the capacity of a community to apply for government programs, it is possible that some government agency might disqualify a community because of its present or past association with Katimavik. However, such action requires that the granting agency know of the community's involvement with Katimavik; and as Katimavik does not communicate its decisions to any other agencies, any

disqualification seems unlikely. Therefore, it seems as if participation in Katimavik has no such cost component.

Land and Existing Structures. Another cost to the community is the value of land and existing structures used in the Katimavik project. However, land and structures remain under the community's ownership. Therefore, value of land or structure should only be considered if it were included in the value of the finished product; but it was not included in the value of any Katimavik work project. The value of neither the land nor structure has deteriorated; therefore, these costs may be ignored in the cost-benefit equation, and so we may simplify the analysis both conceptually and analytically.

Materials. Any supplies used on a project are not recoverable, hence must be taken into account. This has been mostly accomplished by the Katimavik staff. The total cost to the sponsors for materials in Year IV was unavailable, and so was extrapolated from figures provided by three regions: B.C., Prairies, and Quebec. The estimate for year IV is $475,000.

Supervision. A further cost to the community is the cost of hiring supervisors for the Katimavik projects. Complete figures were again unavailable, so we extrapolated as before. The figure for all the sites is on the order of $360,000.

Equipment Depreciation. Katimavik is a labour intensive program; little expensive equipment is used, and much of that is provided by Katimavik (e.g. vans). Sponsors sometimes provide items like chain saws, or rent heavy equipment for a few hours. Total depreciation of equipment is therefore insignificant.

TABLE 6: Communities' Benefits and Costs

	Immediate	Medium Term	Long Term
Benefits			
Physical Improvements	$1,250,000	depreciated	depreciated
Spending	$5,000,000	nil	nil
Social Services	benefits,no valuation	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Knowledge	benefits,nv	benefits, nv	benefits,nv
Image	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Costs			
Supplies	$475,000	nil	nil
Supervision	$360,000	nil	nil

Balance: Benefits greater than costs.

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA BENEFITS

Citizens' Understanding. The Government of Canada benefits from Katimavik in a number of ways, one of which is a citizenry with enhanced knowledge and understanding of Canada. There are two classes of citizens who may gain from Katimavik: the townspeople, and the participants. Townspeople may benefit because they are exposed to young adults from all over the country, some of them rural, some urban, some French speaking, etc. In our survey of community leaders and citizens, 35% said that they had obtained a better understanding of Canada because of Katimavik; and, as such processes usually take place on a subconscious level, these figures must be construed as very conservative. Of course, Katimavik participants also gain in this way (see effectiveness study).

Citizens' Language Learning. Another benefit to GOC is that Katimavik increases the number of citizens who have competence in both official languages. Our evaluators estimated that fully 90% of the participants became more competent in their second language, and we estimate the worth of this at $1,800,000 to $2,250,000 (obtained from multiplying the upper and lower limits of benefit for 189 participants by 766/189).

Citizens' Volunteer Ideals. Many of the Katimavik participants came to view volunteer service work as desirable. Seventy-three percent of the participants interviewed expected to continue voluntary service, and 36% of the graduates interviewed indicated that they had continued in volunteer work; similar figures obtained for the mail surveys, and even 25% of the drop-outs and dismissals indicated this commitment. Anecdotally, when we contacted the United Church Saskatchewan Caravan Program during the policy analysis phase, we were told that Katimavik graduates helped to administer their program.

Citizens' Skills. The fact that many Canadians cannot work with their hands is often decried in the newspapers. Provinces are setting up vocational schools to foster such skills; industry has been notified of considerable responsibilities in this area. Therefore, it is no small benefit that Katimavik participants learn to work with their hands, and acquire a diversity of skills. Evidence for this comes from participants, graduates, and sponsors. More than half of the participants interviewed indicated that they had developed useful skills, 90% of the graduates interviewed agreed, and similar figures obtained for those responding to the mail surveys. Eighty percent of the sponsors, when asked if the participants did good quality work, responded

affirmatively. However, we do not feel confident in attaching a dollar value to this benefit.

Reduced Unemployment. If some 1000 people participate in Katimavik for at least part of a year, the unemployment rate is bound to be reduced. If we assume that Canada Manpower's figure of 14.6% unemployment for youths 15 - 24 years old is valid for Katimavik participants, we may calculate the number of expected man-weeks of unemployment for 766 full term participants, and 290 dropouts. Assuming further that Katimavik participants are not available to the work force for 39 weeks, and that dropouts and dismissed participants are in the program for an average of 15 weeks, we may conclude that Katimavik reduces unemployment by about 5000 man-weeks. If one assumes this benefit to be at the level of the federal minimum wage, we may conclude that this benefit alone is worth $650,000 to GOC.

GOC Image. In communities where it is successful, Katimavik may also enhance the image of the GOC. Forty percent of those citizens and community leaders responding indicated that they would like to see Katimavik return to their communities, while only 12% indicated that they would not. This success is very likely to raise the image of the GOC in the eyes of the citizenry.

Communications. Last, the country as a whole can only benefit from improved lines of communications between levels of government. The very structure of Katimavik ensures some improvement: local community leaders prepare proposals to host a Katimavik group; they are thus making contact with a federal program. Increased official contact is likely to follow, if only to find out what else the federal government can do for the community.

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA COSTS

The most visible costs to the Government of Canada are the $11,200,000 annual expenditure for the program, and the building rented to the Katimavik National Office for $1 per year. A further cost is diminished image in those communities in which Katimavik is seen to fail; but as noted previously, only 12% of those responding wanted to have nothing further to do with Katimavik. Another possible cost is diminished prestige in the eyes of those participants who do not have a good Katimavik experience. To estimate this number, we asked participants if they would recommend Katimavik to a friend. Ninety three percent said that they would. Eighty-two percent of the dropouts and dismissals agreed. The Government of Canada has lost little here. There was, however, evidence of other losses: a few Quebecois remarked that they had been

separatists before Katimavik, but were now even more certain that separatism was necessary. GOC has therefore suffered some small losses. Costs to GOC seem to be virtually limited to its direct and indirect payments to OPCAN.

TABLE 7: GOC Benefits and Costs

	Immediate	Medium Term	Long Term
Benefits			
2nd Lang	$2,000,000	diminished	benefits,nv
Employment	$650,000	nil	nil
Volunteers	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Work Skills	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Knowledge	benefits,nv	benefits, nv	benefits,nv
GOC Image	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Communication	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Costs			
OPCAN Grant	$11,200,000	nil	nil
Rent	$ 40,000	nil	nil

TABLE 8: Global Benefits and Costs

	Immediate	Medium Term	Long Term
Benefits			
2nd Lang	$2,000,000	diminished	benefits,nv
Employment	$650,000	nil	nil
Improvements	$1,250,000	depreciated	depreciated
Local Spending	$5,000,000	nil	nil
Volunteers	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Social Service	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Persnl Growth	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Work Skills	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Knowledge	benefits,nv	benefits, nv	benefits,nv

Community Image	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
GOC Image	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
Communication	benefits,nv	benefits,nv	benefits,nv
DOLLAR TOTAL	$8,900,000		

Costs

Lost Wages	$ 2,900,000*	nil	nil
Expenses	$ 145,000*	nil	nil
Materials	$ 475,000	nil	nil
Supervision	$ 360,000	nil	nil
OPCAN Grant	$11,200,000	nil	nil
Rent	$ 40,000	nil	nil
DOLLAR TOTAL	$15,120,000		

*calculated as participants x year's loss + dropouts x .5 year's loss.

NET DOLLAR COST $6,220,000

TO RENT OR TO BUY

Several factors affect renting and buying policy: term of use, extent of use, cash flow, and turnover costs. If the term of use is short relative to the life of the good, one should consider renting; if one expects to use the good extensively and severely, one should again consider renting; one's cash flow may also dictate a renting policy, and turnover costs may make buying an inefficient strategy.

Housing. On-site housing is a major expenditure and should be examined, especially as Katimavik sometimes pays extortionate rents. Whenever these rents are paid to anyone but a sponsor who has undertaken to use the excess on program funding, buying should be considered. However, we should also note the astronomical interest rates, and the costs of buying and selling, which both tend to make high rents more palatable; and recent experience on the west coast indicates the dangers of speculation. A final reason against a general policy of buying, however, is that Katimavik should not stay longer than two years in any community, to avoid displacing local volunteer labour (see Palmer, J.L., ed. "Creating Jobs: Public Employment and Wage Subsidies", Brookings Institute, 1978).

Vehicles. An altogether different set of arguments obtains for vehicles. Katimavik leases vans for much of their useful life (typically 1-3 year leases). While Katimavik is currently hard on vans (because the vans have several drivers instead of one, irregular maintainance, etc.), these effects could easily be minimized or eliminated by a section in the program manual on routine maintainance. One participant could also be made responsible for the routine maintainance of each van, thus increasing involvement and increasing opportunities for personal development. In addition, ownership usually makes people more careful and sensitive in their treatment of machinery. Katimavik's cash flow situation also seems capable of supporting fleet buying. Turnover costs should not be inordinately large, as the vehicles could easily be sold upon the participants' departure (and rural prices are notoriously higher), or at some central point. We understand that Katimavik plans to buy some vans this year as a pilot project, and we believe this to be an excellent policy.

Office Equipment. Office equipment is used for most of its useful life; it is used no harder than average; cash flow presents no problem; and turnover costs are small. Katimavik owns most of its office equipment, and we entirely concur with this policy.

Computing. Katimavik spends $28,000/ year on renting computing hardware for payroll, participant selection, and mailing lists. We note that the largest job ever run required 125,000 bytes of 7 bits. A complete Wang computing system, with a 128,000 byte (8 bit) CPU, 10 megabyte hard disk, floppy disk, document printer, 5 CRT terminals, and software costs less than $50,000. A DEC CPU with 128,000 bytes of 16 bits (PDP11/23), 10 megabytes of hard disk storage, with four ports, costs about $37,000. Terminals cost about $2300 each, and maintainance costs about $4500. Moreover, each provides some sort of word processing capability, which typically reduces secretarial expenses as well.

OPERATION TO CAPACITY

Personnel. We may now examine the extent to which Katimavik personnel are fully occupied. Field staff are certainly fully occupied; in fact, some are reputed to have brought suit against Katimavik for allegedly violating minimum wage laws. Regional office staffs also seem well occupied, not only in running the projects, but in recruiting field staff and performing many accounting functions. The only excess (by usual standards) seems to be in accounting, where the 30 coordinators are supervised by the five budget comptrollers from the regional offices, who are in turn supervised by four accountants in the national office, to

oversee a budget of less than $12,000,000. In contrast, note that not one person in any office has program development as a sole responsibility.

The hiring of additional staff members goes through a comprehensive justification process; each additional permanent employee must be ultimately approved by the Board. The size of field staff is directly tied to the number of projects, hence to the number of participants. Total regional and national office staffs are related to number of participants as follows.

TABLE 9: Participants and Staff

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
NO and RO staff	54	55	63	53
Participants (beginning)	1036	1272	1375	1057

r=.85

This is a very high correlation, indicating no further inefficiencies.

Information. In every year since its inception, Katimavik has acquired information from more sources. In one sense, this is laudable; a plethora of information permits tight control and precise program development. However, serious problems have been long identified, and not attacked

(e.g. field staff attrition, poor quality work projects). There has been little program development, especially in the light of what is required; indeed, program development seems to be of less importance than accounting (there are nine people exclusively involved in accounting, not one in program development). The new executive committee on program development does not begin to bridge the gap. Thus, information gathering appears to have assumed more importance than it deserves.

Project Duplication. There is little evidence of duplication of effort on the part of sponsors within the same community, or in neighbouring communities. Katimavik seems well set up to avoid this problem.

Ininsured Losses. There is some evidence of uninsured items being stolen, but we are as red by the regional and national offices that this problem is insignificant.

Number of Vans. A maximum of two vans operate at most sites. If we consider a site whose projects are 20 kilometers apart, assume that each group leader spends one hour per day in unneccessary driving (six one-way trips by each of two group leaders may be necessary to pick up and return a van), and that a group leader's time is worth $4 per hour, we find that (270 days x 3 group leaders x 1 hour x $4 =) $3240 worth of group leader's time is spent unproductively. The gasoline,

oil, and depreciation costs of 6 unnecessary trips of 20 km each are also substantial; a figure of $40 is probably low. One such trip every third day ammounts to (270/3 trips x $40 =) $3600. To lease a van for a year costs about $3500. Thus the total cost of not having a third van at such a project ($3240 + $3600 = $6840) is much greater than what is saved. Moreover, a group leader who has spent so much time driving will probably be less able to discharge the rest of his duties, because of the nervous strain of driving, especially on secondary roads in winter. The two van policy is therefore counterproductive and expensive.

If we assume that two thirds of the projects are sufficiently dispersed to require 3 vans, 20 more vans are required. The cost of these 20 vans would be about 20 x $3500 = $70,000 (leasing) per year.

Site Selection. Cost considerations seem to affect site selection, but procedures and weighting vary from region to region. Some regions use highly informal procedures. It is possible that such fluid procedures have been necessitated by late funding; but they should be changed to include cost projections, which should be given some specific weight.

Administrative Cost. "Total administrative cost" is not as easy to define as one might expect. One might define it as the sum of expenditures on specific functions such as finance,

personnel, etc.; the remainder of total program cost minus money spent directly on participants minus direct full-time support; or a figure based on a management model. We have operationally defined "total administrative cost" as total program cost - (money spent directly on participants + direct full-time support), for two reasons: it is an intuitive definition, and it is simple enough to permit comparison across programs within contract guidelines. This figure is presented in the policy analysis.

Advertising and Publications. We are unable to comment on advertising costs and performance in as much detail as we would like, because much of the information has been repeatedly requested and promised, but not delivered. However, we note that

1) participants at one site ridiculed certain Katimavik recruitment advertising, deriding it as childish and misleading. This is serious because advertising provides, for better or for worse, the primary selection criterion;

2) Mishmak, one of the publications for internal consumption, was despised by most participants and staff at eight sites;

3) the program manual is full of advice on conservation, but has much wasted space on most pages;

4) the printed materials are very glossy and expensive looking, despite the "conserver" image Katimavik wishes to project;

5) many field staff view the mandatory scrap book (containing

all local references to Katimavik) as useless, and a vexation. It seems as if little marketing research is done on any of these items, to their severe detriment.

Board of Directors. Members of the Board receive no honoraria, and their only expenses are travel expenses. There is little evidence of wastage here, given a budget of $91,000.

Executive Salaries. Executive salaries and expenses seem comparable to other major government programs; however, in the context of a conserver program and the outright exploitation of the field staff, one is forced to conclude that these "reasonable" salaries are not consistent with the Katimavik spirit. For if the executives alone do not sacrifice, they must be seen as parasitic and hypocritical by those who do. There are several remedies, and one should be implemented.

Field Staff. As we saw in the effectiveness report, 54 of the 90 group leaders left after the participants arrived. We showed that this would result in sub-optimal program efficiency for about 2 months, with a resultant (54/90 x 2/9 =) 13% of the program being run at marginal efficiency. If we assume that this marginal efficiency averages 50%, we calculate a net loss of ($11,200,000 x 13% x 50% =) $750,000. Further, if the training camps are of use (costing $157,000), then an attrition rate of 55% indicates a cash waste of

$86,350; total costs of this policy are therefore approximately $830,000.

Something should be done to reduce field staff attrition. A two tiered strategy presents itself:

1) more pay, more benefits;

2) more time off (provided by a fourth group leader apprenticing at each project).

We have done no specific research on the increased salaries and benefits required; but we note that field staff seem only to want parity with percentage increases given to national and regional offices, and parity in medical and dental plans. All this could be provided at a cost of about $1600 (raises from Year 4 level) + $230 (medical/dental/vision) = $1830 per staffer, or $220,000 to the program.

Let us now calculate the cost of adding a fourth group leader to the field staff team. If we assume a starting salary and benefits of $12,000 and a food allowance of $1000, then 30 extra group leaders would cost ($13,000 x 30 =) $390,000. If we further assume a linear increase in training cost, extra training costs would ammount to at most $39,250. Therefore, total cost of 30 new group leaders would be $39,250 + $390,000 = $430,000.

Adoption of these reforms should reduce effective field staff attrition to near zero (where "effective field staff

attrition" is defined as the number of untrained or inexperienced field staff who must take over in mid program). Total cost is $430,000 + $220,000 = $650,000.

ECONOMIES OF SCALE

An economy of scale is a large increase in output for a small increase in input. In Katimavik's case, an economy of scale would be a large increase in program effectiveness for a small increase in expenditure. An economy of scale could also take the form of a small budgetary decrease going unnoticed.

The traditional method of examining for economies of scale is to compare several program sites, each making the same capital improvements and providing the same social services, but with different numbers of participants. After correcting for efficiency, one examines what each site is accomplishing. If, for example, one site is constructing twice as much ski trail, with only 50% more capital and 50% more labour, we may conclude that Katimavik exhibits increasing returns to scale; i.e. will be more efficient if a bit larger.

The defects in this strategy are:

1) data availability;
2) confounding factors (sponsor variability, physical

geography, and field staff could <u>each</u> account for vast differences; any scale economies would be swamped by this variability);

3) most sites have approximately the same number of participants.

We must therefore forego such analyses. One must not, however, forego all methods of attack.

One obvious place to examine is the number of regional office staff, compared to the number of projects served, and the budget. Any notable deviations indicate that an economy of scale could be harvested. The following crosstabulation reveals no such inefficiencies, only a better cost figure for the Quebec office, which is mostly attributable to reasons other than superior management.

TABLE 10: Projects, Staff, and Budgets

Number of Projects		Number of Staff	Budget
Pacific	5	6	$265,864
Prairies	6	6	$335,329
Ontario	6	6	$317,260
Quebec	8	8	$339,670
Atlantic	5	6	$291,210

We have previously discussed several other measures which would yield economies of scale: buying a computer (with the promise of yet more economies for a larger operation); providing three vans for each geographically diverse project; a fourth (apprentice) group leader for each project; higher salaries and benefits for field staff; and a permanent full time program development staff. Total cost of these measures would be approximately $750,000 per year, plus $50,000 one-time outlay for computer hardware. Some of these costs may be recovered by streamlining accounting functions, word processing, more spartan publications, possible freezing of executive salaries and benefits, and other small economies noted elsewhere in the report.

Last, we note that these reforms should be achievable within existing funding, as OPCAN has made a practice of returning a significant part of its grant each year.

POLICY ANALYSIS

There are two components to our policy analysis: a series of brief descriptions of comparable programs, and a comparison of these in tabular form. Note that we have done a comprehensive effectiveness study only of Katimavik, and so have relied on documents in the public domain, augmented by telephone contacts, for information on the other programs. We were not confident of the precision of all responses, especially those responses purporting to compare program effectiveness against Katimavik's. We therefore formed a matrix of program objectives rather than a matrix of program effectiveness, as we thought the data was so imperfect as to render the latter exercise meaningless.

CANADA STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Sponsor: Quebec Student Intra-Exchange Program

Description: English and French speaking children visit each others' homes.

Duration: one month.

Objectives: biligual and cultural exchange, especially between rural and urban environments.

Cost: $308,977

Participants: 1128

Target population: youth 10 - 15

Cost to participant: $25 - $50

Data from year: 1979

CANADA WORLD YOUTH

Sponsor: CWY

Description: participants live in groups of 16, 8 Canadians and 8 foreigners (including 2 group leaders). They spend half their time in Canada, and half abroad.

Duration: 7 months

Objectives: international knowledge and understanding, knowledge and understanding of Canada.

Cost: $5,106,769

Participants: 658

Target population: youth 17 - 20

Cost to participant: none

Data from year: 1980

CCCJ STUDENT EXCHANGE

Sponsor: Canadian Council of Christians and Jews

Description: English and French speaking students, matched for age, sex, education and interests visit each others' homes. There are no formal language lessons; the emphasis is on learning through contact with the family.

Duration: 2 weeks in each home.

Objectives: encourage bilingualism, develop understanding and goodwill between anglophone and francophone youth.

Cost: $819,854.

Participants: 2500 (this figure may not be accurate)

Target population: youth 14 - 18

Cost to participant: $45, when between Quebec and/or Atlantic and Ontario; $60 when between Quebec and the western provinces.

Data from year: 1981

EDUCATION CANADA

Sponsor: Canadian Bureau for International Education

Description: exchange students join another family, school and community for 1 - 4 months.

Duration: 1 - 4 months.

Objective: participants learn first-hand about their country and its people.

Cost: $381,083

Participants: 647

Target population: youth 14 - 22

Cost to participant: none

Data from year: 1980

INTERCHANGE ON CANADIAN STUDIES

Sponsor: ICS

Description: student delegates from all provinces and territories of Canada gather together in one location in Canada to discuss various issues and to exchange ideas pertaining to Canadian culture.

Duration: approximately 10 days including travelling.

Objectives: to increase understanding between students and people across the country; to increase students' understanding of Canada.

Cost: $250,000 (this figure is imprecise)

Participants: 474

Target population: youth 15 - 18

Cost to participant: transportation to conference site.

Data from year: 1981

INTRA-CORPORATE EXCHANGE VISITS

Sponsor: Canadian Council Of Christians And Jews

Description: corporate employees' children are matched, then one is the other's host and vice versa (one week period). Many exchanges are between English and French speaking families.

Duration: 14 days.

Objectives: to develop understanding and goodwill among company employees; to allow participants to learn about people in other parts of Canada; to increase bilingualism.

Cost: $360,000 ($170,000 provided by Open House Canada).

Participants: 700 (this figure is imprecise)

Target population: youth 14 - 18

Cost to participant: none.

Data from year: 1981

KATIMAVIK

Sponsor: OPCAN

Description: participants spend nine months in small communities doing community service work.

Duration: 9 months

Objectives: service to the host community, personal development of participants, increased environmental awareness, and increased knowledge and understanding of Canada.

Participants: 1056 beginning, 766 completing

Target population: youth 17 - 21

Cost: $11,200,000 (1980-81 budget)

Cost to participant: nil

Data from year: 1981

LESTER B. PEARSON COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC

Sponsor: LBPCP

Description: Pearson College is an educational institution. Students also provide services to the Greater Victoria community.

Duration: 2 "years" of 32 weeks.

Objectives: to promote international understanding through education and exposure to different cultures; personal and intellectual growth; environmental awareness.

Cost: $2,200,000

Participants: 200

Target population: youth 16 - 18

Cost to participant: none

Data from year: 1981

NATIONAL YOUTH FORUM

Sponsor: Canadian Council of Christians and Jews

Description: there are two parts to the program: first, students billet with those of host province and secondly, a conference is held on topics of social concern in Canada.

Duration: billetting: approximately 1 week; Conference: 3-4 days.

Objectives: to give students the opportunity to explore various social issues; offer a learning experience through visiting and exchange; raise consciousness of

group and individual on social issues; motivate participants to help create greater public awareness of social issues.

Costs: $24,000

Participants: 44

Target population: Youth 16 - 19

Cost to participant: participants living nearby must host several others.

Data from year: 1981

OPEN HOUSE CANADA TRAVEL GRANTS PROGRAM

Sponsor: Open House Canada

Description: two groups of participants visit each others' homes.

Duration: at least 5 days; average 7 - 10 days.

Objectives: help young people learn about other parts of the country.

Participants: 28,582

Target population: youth 14 - 22

Cost to participants: $10

Cost: $10,412,000

Data from year: 1980

OPERATION BEAVER

Sponsor: Frontiers Foundation

Description: volunteers provide community service work in disadvantaged areas, in the Americas and Africa.

Duration: 2 - 24 months; average 3.5 months.

Objectives: international knowledge and understanding, personal growth, and community self-help.

Costs: $642,121

Participants: 100 (this figure is imprecise)

Target population: citizens of all nations, 18 and over.

Cost to participant: travel costs to Canada.

Data from year: 1980

SALT

Sponsor: Mennonite Central Committee

Description: young Mennonites each take a job in a SALT community, and live communally in a SALT house for 11 months. Group activities and classes have a religious flavour.

Duration: 11 months.

Objectives: religious growth, service to others, personal growth.

Cost: $96,625. Most is the participants' earnings.

Participants: 18

Target population: Mennonite youth 17 - 20.

Cost to participant: travel to SALT site.

Data from year: 1980

SUMMER AND SCHOOL YEAR EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Sponsor: Bilingual Exchange Secretariat

Description: Ontario and Quebec youths are matched for age, sex, etc., and visit each others' homes; during the school# year, group arrangements are made by participants' schools.

Duration: summer, 2 weeks; school year, 1 - 20 days; average 5 days.

Objectives: to promote bilgualism.

Cost: $1,800,000

Participants: 7996

Target population: summer, youth 13 - 18; school year, 5 - 18.

Cost to participant: summer, $85; school year, $20

Data from year: 1981

UNITED CHURCH CARAVAN PROGRAM

Sponsor: United Church of Canada

Description: volunteers (16 - 21) are involved in various community service projects, some with religious overtones, some without. Participants help with various projects for one week at a time.

Duration: 2 - 8 weeks; average 3 weeks.

Objectives: personal development, faith development, community service.

Cost: 11,550

Participants: 18

Target population: youth 16 - 21

Cost to participants: none

Data from year: 1981

VISITES INTERPROVINCIALES

Sponsor: VI

Description: matched anglophone and fancophone individuals visit each others' homes; during the school year, group visits are arranged by the participants' schools.

Duration: individuals, 10 - 30 days; groups, 5 - 7 days.

Objectives: promote cultural exchange and experience of second language.

Cost: $91,006

Participants: 2873

Target population: youth 12 - 18, mostly from central Canada

Cost to participant: transportation.

Data from year: 1979

NOTE

Costs in the following tables are calculated on the basis of the number of participants beginning a program.

Goal or Attribute	PROGRAM			
	Katimavik	OHC	CWY	Pearson Coll
Cost/part/day	$39.28	$36.43-52.04	$36.95	$49.11
Overhead/part/day	$12.93	$.71-1.01**	$15.97	$6.00
*Can. knowledge & under.	yes	yes	yes	no
*Environ. awareness	yes	no	no	no
*Service to community	yes	no	yes	yes
*Personal growth	yes	no	yes	yes
*Second language	yes	no	no	yes
International k. & u.	no	no	yes	yes

Goal or Attribute	PROGRAM			
	OP. Beaver	MCC SALT	ICC STUDIES	BIL.EX.SEC.
Cost/part/day	$61.15	$16.26***	$52.74	$45.00
Overhead/part/day	$10.95	unavailable	unavailable	$9.00
*Can. knowledge & under.	yes	yes	yes	yes
*Environ. awareness	no	no	no	no
*Service to community	yes	yes	no	no
*Personal growth	yes	yes	no	no
*Second language	no	no	no	yes
International R. & U.	yes	yes	no	no
Religious growth	no	yes	no	no

*Katimavik goals
**Does not include Secretary of State's indirect contribution to administraton
***Does not include administration, travel, recruitment, orientation, or part-time leader.

Goal or Attribute	PROGRAM			
	Ed. Canada	Vis. Int.	Can.St.Ex.	CCCJ St.Ex.
Cost/part/day	$4.90-19.63	$1.06-6.33	$9.13	$11.71
Overhead/part/day	$1.49-5.95	$.33-2.01	$1.93	unavailable
*Can. knowledge & under.	yes	yes	yes	yes
*Environ. awareness	no	no	no	no
*Service to community	no	no	no	no
*Personal growth	yes	no	no	yes
*Second language	no	yes	yes	yes

Goal or Attribute	PROGRAM		
	CCCJ I.C.E.	CCCJ NYF	UC CARAVAN
Cost/part/day	$36.73	$54.55	$30.55
Overhead/part/day	unavailable	unavailable	$22.62
*Can. knowledge & under.	yes	yes	yes
*Environ. awareness	no	no	no
*Service to community	no	no	yes
*Personal growth	no	no	yes
*Second language	yes	no	no
Religious growth	no	no	yes

*Katimavik goals

We see from the policy analysis tables that Katimavik's goals are shared to a considerable extent by many other programs. Katimavik's gross cost per participant is somewhat higher than average, but not inordinately so. The administrative cost, however, is higher than all but two other programs for which data is available, Caravan and Canada World Youth; moreover, Caravan's total administrative expense is under $9000, hence is probably near the practical minimum. Thus Katimavik's administrative overhead is relatively high.

There are several reasons for this large figure. First, Katimavik tries to do very much; not only are its goals at least as diverse as those of any other program, but it offers considerable support towards these objectives. Second, Katimavik is at pains to maintain a precise accounting system. One coordinator supervises the financial arrangements for each group of 33 participants; one budget officer supervises every six or so coordinators; four accountants in the national office supervise these; and an external auditor supervises everybody. While such attention to detail has its merits, it also has its costs; and it is not obvious that this expensive precision is of any benefit to the program. Third, Katimavik expends considerable effort in standardizing the numerous project sites for rules, goals, and achievement. Any such undertaking must prove expensive, but again it is not obvious that this standardization is necessary. Last, Katimavik has been plagued by late funding. When a program is

unsure of funding, it cannot make optimal use of its resources, hence must appear inefficient to an unfriendly eye. If Katimavik were guaranteed of long term funding, more efficient operation would almost certainly follow.

One last figure should be discussed, Katimavik's gross cost per participant. As we noted in the section on benefits and costs, Katimavik's net cost per participant is 44% lower: $21.15 per participant per day. In these terms, Katimavik is considerably less expensive than previously suspected, and less expensive than many alternatives.

CONCLUSION

Katimavik seems to be no more expensive than comparable programs, especially when its contributions to Canada are considered. There is, however, considerable room for improvement, which will render the program more productive at little added expense, and no increase in funding.

SOS
Prog.Ev.
1981(4)
c.3

PROGRAM EVALUATION

ÉVALUATION des PROGRAMMES

Canada

AN EVALUATION OF KATIMAVIK:

APPENDICES

a report presented to

The Evaluation Directorate
Secretary of State

by

Terrence B. Peace, Ph.D.
Applied Sciences Corporation
504 Davie Street
Vancouver, B.C.

23 October, 1981

This study was paid for by the Secretary of State Department. Results and opinions contained therein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views or the intentions of the Secretary of State Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix I: Selected tables

Appendix II: The Instruments

APPENDIX I

SELECTED TABLES

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V114 BY V173

CONTROLLING FOR.. V178 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF *

V114 BY V173

CONTROLLING FOR.. V178 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

Variables have the following meaning for the ANOVA tables only (the next 10 tables).

V1 Attitudes towards bilingualism
V2 Agency
V3 Environmental awareness
V4 Organization
V5 Practicality
V6 Responsibility
V7 Risk taking propensity
V8 Self confidence
V9 Self control
V10 Tolerance
V11 Sex
V12 Language spoken
V16 Participant type, or control

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V1
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	423.193	5	84.639	8.619	0.000
V11	174.921	1	174.921	17.814	0.000
V12	235.944	1	235.944	24.028	0.000
V16	12.327	3	4.109	0.418	0.740
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	46.739	7	6.677	0.680	0.689
V11 V12	9.130	1	9.130	0.930	0.336
V11 V16	25.465	3	8.488	0.864	0.460
V12 V16	5.049	3	1.683	0.171	0.916
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	58.632	3	19.544	1.990	0.115
V11 V12 V16	58.632	3	19.544	1.990	0.115
EXPLAINED	528.564	15	35.238	3.589	0.000
RESIDUAL	3770.706	384	9.820		
TOTAL	4299.270	399	10.775		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V2
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	106.371	5	21.274	3.788	0.002
V11	13.376	1	13.376	2.382	0.124
V12	35.182	1	35.182	6.264	0.013
V16	57.814	3	19.271	3.431	0.017
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	26.482	7	3.783	0.674	0.694
V11 V12	3.317	1	3.317	0.591	0.443
V11 V16	1.338	3	0.446	0.079	0.971
V12 V16	22.197	3	7.399	1.317	0.268
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	4.099	3	1.366	0.243	0.866
V11 V12 V16	4.099	3	1.366	0.243	0.866
EXPLAINED	136.953	15	9.130	1.626	0.064
RESIDUAL	2156.585	384	5.616		
TOTAL	2293.538	399	5.748		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

ANOVA 08/27/81 PAGE 8

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V3
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	194.655	5	38.931	4.462	0.001
V11	20.562	1	20.562	2.356	0.126
V12	89.609	1	89.609	10.270	0.001
V16	85.757	3	28.586	3.276	0.021
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	90.953	7	12.993	1.489	0.170
V11 V12	22.869	1	22.869	2.621	0.106
V11 V16	30.152	3	10.051	1.152	0.328
V12 V16	35.059	3	11.686	1.339	0.261
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	28.871	3	9.624	1.103	0.348
V11 V12 V16	28.870	3	9.623	1.103	0.348
EXPLAINED	314.479	15	20.965	2.403	0.002
RESIDUAL	3350.667	384	8.726		
TOTAL	3665.146	399	9.186		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V4
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	244.781	5	48.956	2.932	0.013
V11	19.993	1	19.993	1.197	0.275
V12	7.405	1	7.405	0.443	0.506
V16	210.342	3	70.114	4.199	0.006
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	68.307	7	9.758	0.584	0.769
V11 V12	6.089	1	6.089	0.365	0.546
V11 V16	20.270	3	6.757	0.405	0.750
V12 V16	52.546	3	17.515	1.049	0.371
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	17.942	3	5.981	0.358	0.783
V11 V12 V16	17.942	3	5.981	0.358	0.783
EXPLAINED	331.031	15	22.069	1.322	0.186
RESIDUAL	6412.285	384	16.699		
TOTAL	6743.316	399	16.901		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V5
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	61.201	5	12.240	2.466	0.032
V11	32.079	1	32.079	6.463	0.011
V12	11.224	1	11.224	2.261	0.133
V16	17.899	3	5.966	1.202	0.309
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	39.047	7	5.578	1.124	0.347
V11 V12	0.004	1	0.004	0.001	0.977
V11 V16	9.873	3	3.291	0.663	0.575
V12 V16	25.391	3	8.464	1.705	0.165
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	21.790	3	7.263	1.463	0.224
V11 V12 V16	21.790	3	7.263	1.463	0.224
EXPLAINED	122.038	15	8.136	1.639	0.061
RESIDUAL	1906.117	384	4.964		
TOTAL	2028.155	399	5.083		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

ANOVA

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V6
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	34.965	5	6.993	1.287	0.269
V11	0.952	1	0.952	0.175	0.676
V12	13.488	1	13.488	2.482	0.116
V16	21.506	3	7.169	1.319	0.268
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	18.324	7	2.618	0.482	0.848
V11 V12	6.895	1	6.895	1.269	0.261
V11 V16	9.755	3	3.252	0.598	0.616
V12 V16	0.943	3	0.314	0.058	0.982
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	15.087	3	5.029	0.925	0.429
V11 V12 V16	15.087	3	5.029	0.925	0.429
EXPLAINED	68.377	15	4.558	0.839	0.634
RESIDUAL	2086.858	384	5.435		
TOTAL	2155.235	399	5.402		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE. NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V7
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION			SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS			164.744	5	32.949	2.993	0.012
V11			29.780	1	29.780	2.705	0.101
V12			0.737	1	0.737	0.067	0.796
V16			123.500	3	41.167	3.739	0.011
2-WAY INTERACTIONS			19.155	7	2.736	0.249	0.972
V11	V12		0.344	1	0.344	0.031	0.860
V11	V16		14.989	3	4.996	0.454	0.715
V12	V16		4.428	3	1.476	0.134	0.940
3-WAY INTERACTIONS			28.322	3	9.441	0.858	0.463
V11	V12	V16	28.322	3	9.441	0.858	0.463
EXPLAINED			212.223	15	14.148	1.285	0.208
RESIDUAL			4227.402	384	11.009		
TOTAL			4439.625	399	11.127		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * *

V8
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION			SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS			94.969	5	18.994	2.369	0.039
V11			3.660	1	3.660	0.457	0.500
V12			53.474	1	53.474	6.670	0.010
V16			42.319	3	14.106	1.760	0.154
2-WAY INTERACTIONS			93.456	7	13.351	1.665	0.116
V11	V12		19.691	1	19.691	2.456	0.118
V11	V16		51.043	3	17.014	2.122	0.097
V12	V16		9.018	3	3.006	0.375	0.771
3-WAY INTERACTIONS			25.503	3	8.501	1.060	0.366
V11	V12	V16	25.503	3	8.501	1.060	0.366
EXPLAINED			213.928	15	14.262	1.779	0.036
RESIDUAL			3078.462	384	8.017		
TOTAL			3292.389	399	8.252		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE * * * * * * * * * *

V9
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	79.784	5	15.957	1.910	0.092
V11	0.065	1	0.065	0.008	0.930
V12	15.277	1	15.277	1.829	0.177
V16	60.702	3	20.234	2.422	0.066
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	49.135	7	7.019	0.840	0.554
V11 V12	1.808	1	1.808	0.216	0.642
V11 V16	7.563	3	2.521	0.302	0.824
V12 V16	40.308	3	13.436	1.609	0.187
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	28.700	3	9.567	1.145	0.331
V11 V12 V16	28.700	3	9.567	1.145	0.331
EXPLAINED	157.619	15	10.508	1.258	0.226
RESIDUAL	3207.526	384	8.353		
TOTAL	3365.145	399	8.434		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* * * * * * * * * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * * * * * * * * * *

V10
BY V11
V12
V16

* *

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	104.229	5	20.846	4.377	0.001
V11	20.521	1	20.521	4.309	0.039
V12	8.160	1	8.160	1.713	0.191
V16	62.336	3	20.779	4.363	0.005
2-WAY INTERACTIONS	44.153	7	6.308	1.324	0.237
V11 V12	4.030	1	4.030	0.846	0.358
V11 V16	35.153	3	11.718	2.460	0.062
V12 V16	3.623	3	1.208	0.254	0.859
3-WAY INTERACTIONS	26.509	3	8.836	1.855	0.137
V11 V12 V16	26.509	3	8.836	1.855	0.137
EXPLAINED	174.890	15	11.659	2.448	0.002
RESIDUAL	1828.816	384	4.763		
TOTAL	2003.706	399	5.022		

411 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
11 CASES (2.7 PCT) WERE MISSING.

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V114 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150 VALUE = 0.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V114 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IPART1

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81) 08/06/81 PAGE 61

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V114 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150

VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF *

V114 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150 VALUE = 3.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V22 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

LANGC

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
BY V3

V22
CONTROLLING FOR.. VALUE = 2.
V1

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N O F * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V23 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V23 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V24 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V24 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

LANGC 08/06/81 PAGE 9

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF V25 BY V3 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N O F * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V25 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V26 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

LANGC 08/06/81 PAGE 12

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V26 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 2.

* PAGE 1 OF 1

ENGLISH SPEAKERS

V26	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V3: YEARS OF PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION 0.1	1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	5.1	6.1	7.1	8.1	9.1	ROW TOTAL
GOOD 1.		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	4
		0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	4.8
		0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	
		0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	
USE OF CONNECTING PHRASES 2.		4	0	0	2	3	4	1	0	3	5	22
		18.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	13.6	18.2	4.5	0.0	13.6	22.7	26.2
		36.4	0.0	0.0	22.2	30.0	44.4	16.7	0.0	21.4	71.4	
		4.8	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.6	4.8	1.2	0.0	3.6	6.0	
3.		5	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	7	1	37
		13.5	10.8	8.1	8.1	10.8	10.8	8.1	8.1	18.9	2.7	44.0
		45.5	57.1	37.5	33.3	40.0	44.4	50.0	100.0	50.0	14.3	
		6.0	4.8	3.6	3.6	4.8	4.8	3.6	3.6	8.3	1.2	
4.		1	1	2	3	3	0	2	0	2	0	14
		7.1	7.1	14.3	21.4	21.4	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	16.7
		9.1	14.3	25.0	33.3	30.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	
		1.2	1.2	2.4	3.6	3.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	
POOR 5.		1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
		14.3	14.3	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	8.3
		9.1	14.3	37.5	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	
		1.2	1.2	3.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		11	7	8	9	10	9	6	3	14	7	84
		13.1	8.3	9.5	10.7	11.9	10.7	7.1	3.6	16.7	8.3	100.0

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V27 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

LANGC 08/06/81 PAGE 14

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

CROSSTABULATION OF V27 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

PAGE 1 OF 1

ENGLISH SPEAKERS

V27	V3 / COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	YEARS OF PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION 0.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	ROW TOTAL
1. HIGH		0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	5
		0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	6.0
		0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	
		0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	
2.		4	0	0	3	2	4	2	0	1	4	20
		20.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	20.0	23.8
		36.4	0.0	0.0	33.3	20.0	44.4	33.3	0.0	7.1	57.1	
ECONOMY & ACCURACY		4.8	0.0	0.0	3.6	2.4	4.8	2.4	0.0	1.2	4.8	
3.		5	4	3	2	4	4	2	3	8	2	37
		13.5	10.8	8.1	5.4	10.8	10.8	5.4	8.1	21.6	5.4	44.0
		45.5	57.1	37.5	22.2	40.0	44.4	33.3	100.0	57.1	28.6	
		6.0	4.8	3.6	2.4	4.8	4.8	2.4	3.6	9.5	2.4	
4.		1	1	2	3	3	0	2	0	3	0	15
		6.7	6.7	13.3	20.0	20.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	17.9
		9.1	14.3	25.0	33.3	30.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	21.4	0.0	
		1.2	1.2	2.4	3.6	3.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	3.6	0.0	
5. LOW		1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
		14.3	14.3	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	8.3
		9.1	14.3	37.5	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	
		1.2	1.2	3.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		11	7	8	9	10	9	6	3	14	7	84
		13.1	8.3	9.5	10.7	11.9	10.7	7.1	3.6	16.7	8.3	100.0

LANGC

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81) 08/06/81 PAGE 15

CROSSTABULATION OF V28 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1

VALUE = 1.

PAGE 1 OF 1

FRENCH SPEAKERS

V28	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	V3 YEARS OF PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION 0.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	ROW TOTAL
1. HIGH		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	2
		0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	3.0
		0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	
2.		0	0	1	0	3	2	2	7	2	4	
		0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	14.3	9.5	9.5	33.3	9.5	19.0	21
		0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	42.9	18.2	100.0	58.3	28.6	30.8	31.8
		0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	10.6	3.0	6.1	
3.		3	2	2	1	3	6	0	4	3	5	
		10.3	6.9	6.9	3.4	10.3	20.7	0.0	13.8	10.3	17.2	29
		60.0	50.0	66.7	50.0	42.9	54.5	0.0	33.3	42.9	38.5	43.9
		4.5	3.0	3.0	1.5	4.5	9.1	0.0	6.1	4.5	7.6	
4.		2	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	
		18.2	18.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	9.1	9.1	18.2	11
		40.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	18.2	0.0	8.3	14.3	15.4	16.7
		3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	3.0	
5. LOW		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	4.5
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		5	4	3	2	7	11	2	12	7	13	
		7.6	6.1	4.5	3.0	10.6	16.7	3.0	18.2	10.6	19.7	66
												100.0

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V28 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V29 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF V29 BY V3 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V171
CONTROLLING FOR..
V178

BY V173

VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF *

V171 BY V173

CONTROLLING FOR..

V178 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V142 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR..

V150 VALUE = 0.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V142 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IPART1 08/06/81 PAGE 149

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V142 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR..

V150 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
V142 BY V146
CONTROLLING FOR.. VALUE = 3.
V150
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V101 BY V173

CONTROLLING FOR.. V178 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
V101
BY V173
CONTROLLING FOR..
V178
VALUE = 2.
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 09/17/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V9 BY V22

CONTROLLING FOR..

V1 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 09/17/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V9 BY V22

CONTROLLING FOR..
V1 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IPART1

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF *
V109 BY V146
CONTROLLING FOR.. VALUE = 0.
V150
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IPART1

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
V109 BY V146
CONTROLLING FOR.. VALUE = 1.
V150
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V109 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR.. V150 VALUE = 2.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IPART1 08/06/81 PAGE 42

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V109 BY V146

CONTROLLING FOR..

V150 VALUE = 3.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V109 BY V173

CONTROLLING FOR.. V178 VALUE = 1.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

IGRAD3

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/27/81)

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
V109 BY V173
CONTROLLING FOR.. V178 VALUE = 2. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APPENDIX II

THE INSTRUMENTS

BIN #B22285 A

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

LOCATION: _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

The following statements appear in groups of 10. Read through the group quickly. Then go back and mark the 3 statements that describe you best with a 1. Then mark the 3 statements that apply to you least with a -1. Then go on to the next group, and do it all again.

Please make sure to mark exactly 3 sentences like you, and exactly 3 unlike you.

SAMPLE GROUP

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) You are well liked by men and women alike.			col 1-2
2) You would rather have fun than be healthy.			col 3-4
3) You are generous with money.			col 5-6
4) You do not have many good friends.			col 7-8
5) You are trusted by all who know you.			col 9-10
6) You expect to be active politically, sometime during your life.			col 11-12
7) You suspect that most businessmen are dishonest.			col 13-14
8) You are religious, in your own way.			col 15-16
9) You have always been prone to temper tantrums.			col 17-18
10) You do not complain, you just accept things.			col 19-20

BIN #B22285

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

GROUP I

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) You can influence companies by selective shopping and consumer action.			col 1-2
2) You think that jobs are more important than the environment.			col 3-4
3) You never over-react.			col 5-6
4) You are sometimes impractical.			col 7-8
5) You have a reputation for reliability.			col 9-10
6) You would like to start your own business.			col 11-12
7) A second language would be of little use to you.			col 13-14
8) You have a hard time with budgets.			col 15-16
9) You are bored with talk about other countries.			col 17-18
10) You expect people to like you.			col 19-20

GROUP II

1) You have good friends from another race or culture			col 21-22
2) You usually get stage-fright when addressing a group.			col 23-24
3) You believe in preventative maintenance, in fixing something before it breaks.			col 25-26
4) You sometimes just give up.			col 27-28
5) You feel that a city with a large minority population is more interesting than a city without.			col 29-30
6) You would conserve even if it was more expensive to do so.			col 31-32
7) You want to see social injustice corrected, but not all at once.			col 33-34
8) You like to work with your hands.			col 35-36
9) You are quite cautious.			col 37-38
10) You have a bad temper.			col 39-40

ASK

GROUP III

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) You are more easygoing than organized.	-		col 41-42
2) You think that bilingual people are more creative than others.			col 43-44
3) You don't mind fighting for your rights.			col 45-46
4) You would prefer to have enough energy, irrespective of pollution.			col 47-48
5) You would prefer not to work on a commission basis.			col 49-50
6) You were seldom disciplined in school.			col 51-52
7) You usually make a good impression on strangers.			col 53-54
8) You are very concerned about your appearance.			col 55-56
9) You never find yourself rushed at the last minute.			col 57-58
10) You prefer to talk to people with similar backgrounds.			col 59-60

GROUP IV

1) You tend to make mistakes by relying to much on your memory.			col 61-62
2) You stick to your opinions, even when you know they are wrong.			col 63-64
3) You can work to a timetable.			col 65-66
4) You sometimes get into (physical) fights.			col 67-68
5) You think that risk is just part of life.			col 69-70
6) You approve of bilingualism.			col 71-72
7) You think that many social problems cannot be solved.			col 73-74
8) You think that the policy of bilingualism is an infringement of your freedom.			col 75-76
9) You dislike long discussions about details.			col 77-78
10) You approve of Greenpeace.			col 79-80

GROUP V

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) You would enjoy sky-diving or hang-gliding.			col 1-2
2) You are easy to get along with.			col 3-4
3) You don't like to approach strangers.			col 5-6
4) You would prefer not to meet "little green men" from outer space.			col 7-8
5) You often find solutions by letting the fine points look after themselves.			col 9-10
6) You hate taking responsibility for a task.			col 11-12
7) You think that the government should be more concerned about the environment.			col 13-14
8) You like to plan things in advance.			col 15-16
9) If you learned a second language, mastery of your first language would possibly deteriorate.			col 17-18
10) You don't have much control over your future.			col 19-20

GROUP VI

1) You know your weaknesses.			col 21-22
2) You think that accounting is silly.			col 23-24
3) You think that bilingual people are more cultured.			col 25-26
4) You think that Canada should have a more liberal immigration policy.			col 27-28
5) You often intimidate those who disagree with you.			col 29-30
6) You believe that we could conquer pollution if we really wanted to.			col 31-32
7) You often daydream.			col 33-34
8) You will not recycle when you leave Katimavik.			col 35-36
9) You enjoy administrative duties.			col 37-38
10) You do not like "adventures".			col 39-40

ASC

GROUP VII

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) Learning a second language would open new horizons for you.			col 41-42
2) You love to travel.			col 43-44
3) You sometimes throw things when angry.			col 45-46
4) You are capable of almost everything you attempt.			col 47-48
5) You can have fun in a game, even if you get a few bruises.			col 49-50
6) You hate deadlines.			col 51-52
7) You feel powerless to change government policy.			col 53-54
8) You do not want to be a leader.			col 55-56
9) You are concerned about acid rain.			col 57-58
10) You believe that the ends do <u>not</u> justify the means.			col 59-60

GROUP VIII

1) You sometimes drop litter in the street.			col 61-62
2) You have considered a career in engineering.			col 63-64
3) You expect your performance to be good in novel situations.			col 65-66
4) You seldom loose your temper.			col 67-68
5) You agree that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush".			col 69-70
6) You become nervous when people around you talk in a language you can't understand.			col 71-72
7) You are impatient with foreigners.			col 73-74
8) You are exhilerated by the potential benefits of space exploration.			col 75-76
9) You never "leave it to somebody else".			col 77-78
10) You are punctual.			col 79-80

GROUP IX

	-1 Least Describe	1 Best Describe	DO NOT WRITE
1) You easily control your desires.			col 1-2
2) You are not impressed by warnings about cancer or other health hazards.			col 3-4
3) You want to further social tolerance.			col 5-6
4) You think that the Eastern mystics are silly.			col 7-8
5) You don't talk much in groups.			col 9-10
6) You often miss busses.			col 11-12
7) You complete whatever projects you begin.			col 13-14
8) You find the present pace of technological change exciting.			col 15-16
9) You don't think that present levels of pollution are dangerous.			col 17-18
10) You really want to master a second language.			col 19-20

GROUP X

1) You are more concerned with what works than with theory.			col 21-22
2) You can accept undertainty if there are large potential rewards.			col 23-24
3) You despise the Ku Klux Klan.			col 25-26
4) You have considered a career in administration.			col 27-28
5) You are uncomfortable when trying to talk in another language.			col 29-30
6) You sometimes want to resign from the human race.			col 31-32
7) You sometimes become very emotional in bad situations.			col 33-34
8) You become annoyed with litterbugs.			col 35-36
9) Your opinion of yourself is far more important than what other people think of you.			col 37-38
10) You hate working overtime for any reason.			col 39-40

BIN #B22285 B

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

PARTICIPANT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Place the number corresponding to your answer on the adjacent line. Ignore "col 1", "col 43-44", etc. We put "col 1" in the margin only to make life easier for the key punch operators. Take your time.

1) Are the Katimavik projects (which you have worked on) of any use to the host community? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 1

2) Have you personally helped to build something on this project? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 2

3) Have your general work habits improved since you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 3

4) Are you more physically fit than when you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 4

5) Will you continue to pursue an active
a) physical life? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 5
b) intellectual life? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 6

6) Do you plan to go to university? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 7

7) Have you developed useful skills in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 8

8) Do you use conserver technologies on the project work sites? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 9

9) Have you learned to use any environmentally appropriate technologies? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 10

10) Are you more self-sufficient than when you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 11

11) Has Katimavik taught you anything which will be of use to you when you look for a job? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 12

IF YES: What? _____

_____

12) Are you now better equipped to live in a society of scarce resources? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 13

13) Will you volunteer for further community service when you leave Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 14

14) Was there good cooperation in working in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 15

15) Was there good cooperation in living in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 16

16) Does your group have a good sense of solidarity? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 17

17) How many of the following places are represented by people in your group of 11 participants?

NWT or Yukon
B.C.
Prairies
Ontario
Quebec
Maritimes
Newfoundland (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) _____ col 18

18) Are the other people in your group of eleven all from the same socio-economic background?
1) yes
2) no
col 19

19) Does your group have more self-discipline than when you started?
1) yes
2) no
col 20

20) Do you have more self-discipline than when you started Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no
col 21

21) Do you have better nutritional habits than when you started Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no
col 22

22) Are you more self-aware than when you joined?
1) yes
2) no
col 23

23) Are you now more aware of the problems of society?
1) yes
2) no
col 24

24) Do you want to help to solve these problems?
1) yes
2) no
col 25

25) Are you more aware of regional current events?
1) yes
2) no
col 26

26) Are you more aware of political current events?
1) yes
2) no
col 27

27) Do you have a clearer idea of what you want to do with your life?
1) yes
2) no
col 28

28) Were you already fluent in both official languages before joining Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no
col 29

IF NOT: a) Are you now more fluent in the other official language than you were?
1) yes
2) no
col 30

b) Do you now have a working knowledge of the other official language?
1) yes
2) no
col 31

29) Is Katimavik generally accepted by the townspeople?
1) accepted by most
2) accepted by some
3) accepted by none
col 32

30) Do you personally feel alienated or close to other Canadians?
1) alienated
2) close to
col 33

31) Have any of your group leaders been fired?
1) yes
2) no
col 34

IF YES: Why?_____

_____

32) Have any of your group leaders left voluntarily? How many? (0, 1, 2)
col 35

33) Have you participated in any programs like Katimavik before? How many times? (0, 1, 2, etc.)
col 36

List programs_____

_____

34) Have you been to a francophone project yet?
1) yes
2) no
col 37

35) Katimavik has projects in both anglophone and francophone communities. Is this a good idea?
1) yes
2) no
col 38

ASK

36) What type of job would you like to get?_____

37) What types of jobs would you not accept?_____

38) You do considerable physical work at Katimavik. How much of this work has a lasting effect on the community?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50 %
4) 0 - 25%
col 39

39) How much of this physical work is meaningful?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 25%
col 40

40) Did you ever do a job which mainly seemed to benefit private enterprise?
1) yes
2) no
col 41

41) How much do you learn about the communities in which the projects are located?
1) very much
2) some
3) not much
col 42

42) If you could do it all over again, knowing what you know now about Katimavik, would you choose to join Katimavik again?
1) yes
2) maybe
3) no
col 43

43) Would you recommend Katimavik to a friend?
1) yes
2) no
col 44

44) Why did you join Katimavik?_____

45) What do you like best about Katimavik?_____

46) What do you like least?_____

47) What is your biggest gain from Katimavik?_____

OTHER COMMENTS_____

48) Age _____ col 45-46

49) Sex
1) male
2) female
_____ col 47

50) Have you graduated from high school?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 49

51) Is your home in a city, town, or rural environment?
1) city
2) town
3) rural
_____ col 49

52) In which region is your home?
1) NWT or Yukon
2) B.C.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Quebec
6) Maritimes
7) Newfoundland
_____ col 50

53) Which is your first language?
1) French
2) English
_____ col 51

MILITARY OPTION

53) Why did you choose the military option? _____

_____

_____

_____

54) Would you choose it again?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 52

55) Would you recommend it to a friend?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 53

56) What was your overall opinion of the military before you joined Katimavik?
1) good
2) indifferent
3) bad
_____ col 54

57) What is your opinion now of the Canadian military?
1) better
2) same
3) worse
_____ col 55

58) Could anything be done to improve the military option?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 56

What? _____

_____

_____

59) As far as you could tell, what were the reactions of the regular base officers to Katimavik?
1) favourable
2) neutral
3) unfavourable
_____ col 57

60) Was it difficult to adjust to and from civilian and military projects/
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 58

If so, how? What could be done? _____

_____

BIN #B22285

C

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

CONVERSATIONAL ENGLISH TEST

INSTRUCTIONS:

The interviewer should begin the interview with the usual social exchanges (how are you feeling today, etc.) to determine if the participant has minimum standards of competence in his second language.

If the participant is not minimally capable of undertaking the interview in his second language, the interview will be conducted in the first language. Conversational competence will then not be evaluated in detail.

Some usage checkpoints may not be applicable for the question specified, in some interviews (because, for example, a "yes" may be all that is requested). If inapplicable, code as 0.

Each usage checkpoint is to be graded on a scale of 1 to 3, as follows:

1—correct;
2—not perfect, but understandable given the context or a short clarification;
3—not correct, message not understandable. Long clarifications are required.

1 col 1

Interview conducted in: 1) first language 2) second language _____ col 2

For how many years have you studied English? _____ col 3

Does anyone at home speak a language other French? 1) no 2) English 3) other _____ col 4

When you are at home, do you speak a language other than French? 1) no 2) English 3) other _____ col 5

1) Do you like the Katimavik program here in _____? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 6

Usage checklist: understands question quickly, easily_____

word order _____

uses "a", "the", "an" correctly_____

2) How much did you like the program in _____(previous rotation)? 1) like 2) indifferent 3) dislike _____ col 7

Usage checklist: understands question quickly, easily_____

word order _____

correct tense_____

uses pronouns correctly_____

3) How do you like the program in _____(first rotation)?
1) like
2) indifferent
3) dislike
_____ col 8

Usage checklist: word order _____

correct tense _____

uses pronouns correctly_____

4) Do you like the basic aims of the Katimavik program?
1) like
2) indifferent
3) dislike
_____ col 9

Usage checklist: word order _____

uses pronouns correctly_____

correct tense_____

adequate vocabulary_____

5) What do you think are the basic aims of the Katimavik program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: word order_____

uses pronouns correctly_____

correct mood_____

uses prepositions correctly_____

6) Could the Katimavik program be made into closer agreement with its aims?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 10

If so, how? _____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: understands questions easily_____

word order_____

correct tense_____

makes comparisons correctly_____

7) Have you ever considered leaving Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no
_____ col 11

If yes, why? _____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: word order_____

correct tense_____

uses prepositions correctly_____

uses adequate vocabulary _____

8) Has anyone from your group left Katimavik voluntarily?

1) participant
2) staff
3) nobody

col 12

IF YES: Did you like him (her)?

1) yes
2) indifferent
3) no

col 13

IF YES: Why did he(she) drop out? _____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: word order_____
correct tense_____
uses prepositions correctly_____
uses adequate vocabulary_____

9) Has anyone from your group been dismissed?

1) participant
2) staff
3) nobody

col 14

IF YES: Did you like him(her)?

1) yes
2) no

col 15

IF YES: Why was he(she) dismissed? _____

_____

_____

_____

IF YES: Do you think that this was reasonable?

1) yes
2) no

col 16

Usage checklist: correct tense_____
connects phrases correctly_____
uses adequate vocabulary_____

10) What does it take to make a personal success of Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense _____

connects phrases correctly_____

economical and accurate in expression_____
(NOT the same as "adequate vocabulary";
respondent does not use complicated
phrases where simpler ones would do;
e.g. uses "now", not "this point in time").

11) How could Katimavik be improved?

1) could be
2) could not be _____ col 17

_____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense_____
connects phrases correctly_____
economical & accorage in expression_____

12) Are you satisfied with the living conditions?

1) yes
2) no _____ col 18

IF NO: Why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense_____
connects phrases correctly_____
economical and accurate in expression_____

13) Are you satisfied with the work projects?

1) yes
2) no _____ col 19

IF NO: How could they be improved?_____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense_____
connects phrases correctly_____
economical & accurate in expression_____

14) Are you satisfied with the group leader and co-ordinator?

1) yes
2) no _____ col 20

IF NO: Why not?_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense_____
connects phrases correctly_____
economical & accurate in expression_____

15) How do you like the communities you have worked in?

1) like
2) indifferent
3) dislike

_____ col 21

Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

Usage checklist: correct tense_____

connects phrases correctly_____

economical & accurage in expression_____

THANK YOU

INSTRUCTIONS:

Now rate the respondent's conversational abilities overall, on a scale of 1 to 5, as follows:

1—full competence: respondent reveals no patterns of error and responds appropriately in familiar and unfamiliar situations. Interviewer feels no constraints in the use of his language.

2—acceptable competence: respondent is able to fulfil all the social and work requirements of the Katimavik program using either language. Respondent has sufficient accuracy of structure and vocabulary that errors are not impediments.

3—limited competence: respondent is able to fulfil most (not all) social and work requirements of Katimavik. Respondent has some confidence with second language, but cannot use it easily. Respondent usually uses correct word order, uses nouns, pronouns, and common prepositions correctly, uses correct form of verb and auxiliaries, forms tenses correctly, and uses co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions correctly.

4—elementary competence: respondent can use the second language to fulfil very limited requirements. Respondent is able to indicate time, person of verbs, use cliches, and make simple sentences of the form noun/verb/object.

5—no competence: respondent cannot use the second language to fulfil any social or work requirements of Katimavik.

Rating of the accurate use of idioms _____ col 22

Rating of the use of "a", "an", "the". _____ col 23

Rating of the accurate use of comparison. _____ col 24

Rating of the correct use of tense, and verb forms. _____ col 25

Rating of the (correct) connecting of phrases. _____ col 26

Rating of the economy and accuracy of expression. _____ col 27

Rating of pronunciation. _____ col 28

Rating of understanding. _____ col 29

BIN #B22285 D

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

INSTRUCTIONS: Place the number corresponding to your answer on the adjacent line. Ignore "col 1" ... "col 43-44", etc. We put "col 1" in the margin only to make life easier for the key punch operators. Take your time.

1) Were the Katimavik projects (which you worked on) of any use to the host community? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 1

2) Did you personally help to build something on a Katimavik project? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 2

3) Did your general work habits improve because of Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 3

4) Are you more physically fit than when you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 4

5) Will you continue to pursue an active

a) physical life? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 5

b) intellectual life? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 6

6) Have you attended university? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 7

7) Did you develop useful skills in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 8

8) Did you use conserver technologies on the project sites? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 9

9) Did vou learn to use any environmentally appropriate technologies? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 10

10) Are you more self-sufficient than when you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 11

11) Did Katimavik teach you anything which was of use to you when you looked for a job? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 12

12) Are you now better equipped to live in a society of scarce resources? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 13

13) Did you volunteer for further community service after you left Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 14

14) Was there good cooperation in working in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 15

15) Was there good cooperation in living in Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 16

16) Did your group have a good sense of solidarity? 1) yes 2) no ____ col 17

17) How many of the following places were represented by people in your group?

NWT or Yukon
B.C.
Prairies
Ontario
Quebec
Maritimes
Newfoundland
(1 2 3 4 5 6 or 7)

18) Were the other people in your group all from the same socio-economic background? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 19

19) Did your group acquire more self-discipline than when you started? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 20

20) Do you have more self-discipline than when you started Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 21

21) Do you have better nutritional habits than when you started Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 22

22) Are you more self-aware than when you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 23

23) Are you now more aware of the problems of society? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 24

24) Do you want to help to solve these problems? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 25

25) Are you more aware of regional current events? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 26

26) Are you more aware of political current events? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 27

27) Do you have a clear idea of what you want to do with your life? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 28

28) Were you already fluent in both official languages before joining Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 29

IF NOT: a) Are you now more fluent in the other official language than you were? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 30

b) Do you now have a working knowledge of the other official language? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 31

29) Do you think it is important to be exposed to the other official language? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 32

30) Was Katimavik generally accepted by the townspeople? 1) accepted by most 2) accepted by some 3) accepted by none _____ col 33

31) Do you personally feel alienated or close to other Canadians? 1) alienated 2) close to _____ col 34

32) Katimavik trains people to live in a world of scarce resources. Have you had problems in adapting to a society of plenty? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 35

33) Were any of your group leaders been fired? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 36

IF YES: Why? _____

_____

34) Did any of your group leaders leave voluntarily? How many? (0,1,2) _____ col 37

35) Did you participate in any programs like Katimavik before? How many times? (0,1,2, etc.) _____ col 38

List programs: _____

_____

36) Did you work at a francophone project? 1) yes 2) no

37) Katimavik has projects in both anglophone and francophone communities. Is this a good idea? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 40

38) What type of job do you have now? _____

_____

_____

39) What types of jobs would you not accept? _____

_____

40) Are you interested in politics? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 41

41) Do you belong to a political party? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 42

42) Have you worked in an election campaign? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 43

43) Are you still good friends with other Katimavik participants? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 44

44) How often do you travel more than 100 km to visit your Katimavik friends, in a year? _____ col 44-45

45) Do you still see your pre-Katimavik friends as much as you used to? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 46

46) Are your Katimavik friends closer than other friends? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 47

Comment: _____

_____

_____

47) How do you like the Katimavik concept? 1) very much 2) somewhat 3) indifferent 4) dislike 5) dislike very much _____ col 48

48) What is the Katimavik concept? _____

_____

_____

_____

49) Could the Katimavik projects be put into closer agreement with the Katimavik concept? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 49

How? _____

_____

_____

50) Did you ever consider dropping out of Katimavik? 1) never 2) not seriously 3) yes, seriously 4) yes, I almost did 5) I did _____ col 50

IF YES: Why? _____

_____

_____

51) Did anyone from your group drop out? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 51

IF YES: Did you like him(her)? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 52

IF TWO DROPOUTS: Did you like the second? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 53

IF THREE DROPOUTS: Did you like the third? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 54

IF FOUR DROPOUTS: Did you like the fourth? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 55

IF YES: Why did he/she (they) drop out? _____

_____

_____

52) Was anyone from your group dismissed? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 56

IF YES: Did you like him(her)? 1) yes 2) indifferent 3) no _____ col 57

Why was he(she) dismissed? _____

_____

Do you think that this was reasonable? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 58

53) What does it take to make a success of Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

54) How could Katimavik be improved? _____

_____

_____

1) could be 2) could not be _____ col 59

55) Were you satisfied with the projects? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 60

IF NO: How could they be improved? _____

_____

_____

56) Were you satisfied with the group leaders and the coordinator? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 61

IF NO: Why not? _____

_____

57) Did you like the communities you worked in? 1) yes 2) indifferent 3) no _____ col 62

Why? _____

_____

58) Were you satisfied with the living conditions? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 63

IF NO: Why not: _____

_____

59) If you could do it all over again, knowing what you know now about Katimavik, would you choose to join Katimavik again? 1) yes 2) maybe 3) no _____ col 64

60) Would you recommend Katimavik to a friend? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 65

61) Why did you join Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

62) What do you like best about Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

63) What do you like least? _____

_____

_____

_____

64) What is your biggest gain from Katimavik?_____

_____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

65) You did considerable physical work while with Katimavik. How much of this work had a lasting effect on the community?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 25%
col 66

66) How much of this physical work was meaningful?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 25%
col 68

67) Did you ever do a job which mainly seemed to benefit private enterprise?
1) yes
2) no
col 70

68) Do you listen to radio or watch TV in the other official language?
1) yes
2) no
3) not available
col 71

69) How often do you talk in the other official language?
1) every day
2) every week
3) rarely
4) never
col 72

70) How much did you learn about the communities in which the projects were located?
1) very much
2) some
3) not much
col 73

71) Age
col 74

72) Sex
1) male
2) female
col 75

73) Have you graduated from high school?
1) yes
2) no
col 76

74) Is your home in a city, town, or rural environment?
1) city
2) town
3) rural
col 77

75) In which region is your home?
1) NWT or Yukon
2) B.C.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Quebec
6) Maritimes or Newfoundland
col 78

76) In which year did you participate in Katimavik?
1) 1977-78
2) 1978-79
3) 1979-80
4) 1980-81
col 79

77) Which is your first language?
1) French
2) English
col 79

MILITARY OPTION

CARD 2

77) Why did you choose the military option? _____

_____

_____

_____

78) Would you choose it again? 1)yes 2)no _____ col 1

79) Would you recommend it to a friend? 1)yes 2)no _____ col 2

80) What was your overall opinion of the military before you joined Katimavik? 1)good 2)indifferent 3)bad _____ col 3

81) What is your opinion now of the Canadian military? 1)better 2)same 3)worse _____ col 4

82) Could anything be done to improve the military option? 1)yes 2)no _____ col 5

What? _____

_____

_____

83) As far as you could tell, what were the reactions of the regular base officers to Katimavik? 1)favourable 2)neutral 3)unfavourable _____ col 6

84) Was it difficult to adjust to and from civilian and military projects? 1) yes 2) no _____ col 7

If so, how? What could be done? _____

_____

—THANK YOU—

BIN #B22285

NOTE: 1) This study is sponspored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

DROPOUT/DISMISSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1) When you left Katimavik, was it because:
   1) medical leave
   2) voluntary
   3) dismissed
   _____ col

2) How did this come about? What was your reason for leaving? _____

_____

_____

3) IF DISMISSED:

   (a) Do you think that dismissing you was reasonable?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col

   (b) How do you feel about being dismissed?

   _____

   _____

   (c) PROBE: Then you do (do not) feel bitter?
   1) bitter
   2) not bitter
   _____ col

4) How could your departure have been avoided? _____

_____

_____

_____

5) What did you gain from Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

6) How could Katimavik be improved? _____

_____

_____

_____

BIN #B22285

F

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

SPONSOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number corresponding to your answer.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

1) Were the Katimavik participants dependable when left alone?
1) most
2) some
3) a few

2) Did the participants generally have a positive attitude?
1) most
2) some
3) a few

3) Did the participants do good quality work.
1) most
2) some
3) a few

4) Were you able to fulfil your commitments to Katimavik with respect to:

(a) materials
1) yes
2) no

(b) work
1) yes
2) no

(c) work supervision
1) yes
2) no

5) Did the participants work hard enough?
1) most
2) some
3) a few

Estimate the number of hours a week: _____

6) Have the projects been completed on schedule?
1) yes
2) no
3) not applicable

IF NOT, why not? _____

_____

_____

7) Did the Katimavik people physically make something happen?
1) yes
2) no

What have they made? _____

_____

_____

So far, approximately how much did the materials cost for each of these things? _____

_____

_____

About how much of these materials was provided by Katimavik?

_____

_____

Precisely what were the arrangements for the above? (e.g. rent money)

_____

_____

Approximately how many man-weeks were spent on each of these building projects? _____

_____

8) Did the participants have good personal appearances for the jobs they were doing?
   1) most
   2) some
   3) a few

   Comment: _____

   _____

   _____

9) Were the participants sufficiently prepared for their duties?
   1) most
   2) some
   3) a few

10) Did your organization benefit from Katimavik?
   1) yes
   2) no

11) Did the Katimavik participants seem to benefit from the experience?
   1) most
   2) some
   3) a few

   In what ways? _____

   _____

   _____

12) Do you have any criticisms of Katimavik?
   1) yes
   2) no

   Comment: _____

   _____

   _____

13) Has Katimavik been responsive to your criticism?
   1) yes
   2) no
   3) not applicable

14) Would you work with Kitimavik again?
   1) yes
   2) no

15) Have any neighbouring communities copied one of your Katimavik projects?
   1) yes
   2) no

   IF YES: In which year did your project begin?
   1) 1977-78
   2) 1978-79
   3) 1979-80
   4) 1980-81

   IF SO: What exactly did the other community do?

   _____

   _____

   _____

16) If you have had experience with Katimavik in more than one year, please rank the years (first, second, etc.) for overall effectiveness.
   1977-78 ____
   1978-79 ____
   1979-80 ____
   1980-81 ____

17) Do you approve of the government supporting programs such as Katimavik?
   1) yes
   2) no

18) How could Katimavik be improved? _____

   _____

   _____

19) In which region is your project?
   1) B.C. or Yukon
   2) Prairies or NWT
   3) Ontario
   4) Quebec

BIN #B22285

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number corresponding to your answer. Thank you for your time.

1) Katimavik has done community service work in your community within the last four years. Are you aware of Katimavik?
   1) yes
   2) no

2) What has the Katimavik group accomplished? (Please be as precise as you can.)

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3) Did the Katimavik group build something?
   1) yes
   2) no

4) What did they build?_____

   _____

   _____

5) Is this useful?
   1) very useful
   2) useful
   3) not useful
   4) completely useless

6) Has Katimavik made you more aware of the different ethnic groups which make up our country?
   1) yes
   2) no

7) Has Katimavik made you more acquainted with scarce-resource technologies, like solar energy, recycling, or protecting the environment?
   1) yes
   2) no

8) Was the Katimavik group well behaved?
   1) yes
   2) no
   3) don't know

9) Would you like to see Katimavik come back to your community?
   1) yes
   2) no
   3) don't know

10) Do you feel that the participants benefited from Katimavik?
   1) yes
   2) no
   3) don't know

11) Have any of the Katimavik participants stayed in your community to accept a job?
   1) yes
   2) no

   If so, how many? _____

   In what year(s) were they hired?
   1) 1978
   2) 1979
   3) 1980

   Which phrase best describes what they do?
   1) unskilled
   2) semi-skilled
   3) skilled
   4) semi-professional

ASK

12) Overall, do you think that Katimavik meets its goals of service to the host community, personal growth of the participants, and increased awareness of Canada's diversity and environment?
1) yes
2) no

13) If you have had experience with Katimavik in more than one year, please rank the years (first, second, etc.) for overall effectiveness.
1977-78 ____
1978-79 ____
1979-80 ____
1980-81 ____

14) Perhaps other things in your commmunity also need doing. Please list those things which you think the government should do.
_____
_____
_____
_____

15) How many of these are more important than what Katimavik did? (0, 1, 2, etc.) _____

16) Do you think that the government of Canada should fund programs such as Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no

Why, or why not? _____
_____
_____

Please comment on Katimavik. _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

17) In which region is your home?
1) NWT or Yukon
2) B.C.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Quebec
6) Maritimes or Newfoundland

18) When did you move to your present home town? _____

THANK YOU

BIN #B22285 H

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

ASK

APPLICANT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Place the number corresponding to your answer on the adjacent line. Ignore "col 1"..." etc. We put "col 1" in the margin to make life easier for the key punch operators. Take your time.

1) In which year did you apply?
   1) 1977-78
   2) 1978-79
   3) 1979-80
   4) 1980-81
   _____ col 1

2) When did you learn that you had not been accepted?
   _____

3) How disappointed were you, in not being accepted?
   1) very disappointed
   2) disappointed
   3) not disappointed
   _____ col 2

4) What did you do instead of Katimavik? _____

5) Was this an adequate substitute for Katimavik?
   1) better than Katimavik
   2) adequate
   3) not adequate
   _____ col 3

   COMMENT: _____

6) Was Katimavik polite and reasonable in telling you the news?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col 4

7) Age
   _____ col 5-6

8) Sex
   1) male
   2) female
   _____ col 7

9) Have you graduated from high school?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col 8

10) Have you attended university?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col 9

11) Have you attended vocational school?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col 10

12) Are you doing an apprenticeship?
   1) yes
   2) no
   _____ col 11

13) Is your home in a city, town, or rural environment?
   1) city
   2) town
   3) rural
   _____ col 12

14) In which region is your home?
   1) NWT or Yukon
   2) B.C
   3) Prairies
   4) Ontario
   5) Quebec
   6) Maritimes
   7) Newfoundland
   _____ col 13

THANK YOU

BIN #B22285 I

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

FIELD STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Place the number corresponding to your answer on the adjacent line. These are the questions we have thought to ask. If you want to, write a book. We will read it.

1) Are the Katimavik projects (on which you have worked) of any use to the host community? 1) yes 2) no _____

2) Do you use conserver technology on the project sites? 1) yes 2) no _____

3) Are you proficient in any environmentally appropriate technologies? 1) yes 2) no _____

4) Do you and your participants actually live and work as a team at Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____

5) Do you and your participants have a good sense of solidarity? 1) yes 2) no _____

6) Does your group (with participants) have more self-discipline than when you started Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____

7) One of Katimavik's goals is to help the growth of the participants. Have you experienced personal growth as well? 1) yes 2) no _____

8) Has Katimavik made you more aware of the different ethnic groups which make up our country? 1) yes 2) no _____

9) Were you already fluent in both official languages before you joined Katimavik? 1) yes 2) no _____

IF NOT: a) Are you now more fluent in the other official language than you were? 1) yes 2) no _____

b) Do you now have a working knowledge of the other official language? 1) yes 2) no _____

10) Is Katimavik well accepted by the townspeople? 1) yes 2) indifferent 3) no _____

11) Have any field staff on your project left voluntarily? How many? (0, 1, etc.) _____

12) Have any field staff on your project been fired? 1) yes 2) no _____

IF YES: Was this reasonable?_____

_____

_____

13) Would you work for Katimavik again in the future? 1) yes 2) no _____

14) Would you recommend the Katimavik program to a younger friend as a participant? 1) yes 2) no _____

15) Would you recommend the job of group leader or co-ordinator to a friend? 1) yes 2) no _____

ASK

16) What do you like best about Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17) What do you like the least?

_____

_____

_____

18) What is your biggest gain from Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

_____

19) Does the regional office give you as much support as you need?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF NO: Explain: _____

_____

_____

20) Does the national office give you as much support as you need?
1) yes
2) no
_____

21) Are the written materials supplied by the national office adequate?
1) excellent
2) good
3) fair
4) poor
_____

22) Does the sponsor provide adequate equipment support for this project?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF NO: Explain: _____

_____

_____

23) What equipment does Katimavik have to provide for the work project?
1) bus
2) truck
3) other
4) nothing
_____

24) Are you satisfied with the participants?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF NO: Explain: _____

_____

_____

25) Are you satisfied, overall, with the projects?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF NO: Explain: _____

_____

_____

26) Are you satisfied with the support from the other field staff?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF NO: Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

27) Thinking about the participants again, do you feel that they gain in knowledge and understanding about Canada, from Katimavik?
1) all do
2) 75% do
3) 50% do
4) 25% do
5) none do
_____

28) Katimavik aims at personal development of the participants. In your opinion, how many of the participants do experience personal development?
1) all do
2) 75% do
3) 50% do
4) 25% do
5) none do
_____

29) One of Katimavik's aims is second language competence. How many of the participants significantly improved their linguistic skills while at Katimavik?
1) all do
2) 75% do
3) 50% do
4) 25% do
5) none do
_____

30) Considering Katimavik's goals as a whole, how many participants profit along these lines?
1) all do
2) 75% do
3) 50% do
4) 25% do
5) none do
_____

31) If any participant has dropped out of your group, please take a minute to think why. Please compare him (her) to the rest of the group, especially in terms of capacity to profit from Katimavik.

_____
_____
_____
_____

32) If any participant has been dismissed from your group, please take a minute to think why. Please compare him(her) to the rest of the group, especially in terms of capacity to profit from Katimavik.

_____
_____
_____
_____

33) If you have had experience with Katimavik in more than one year, please rank the years (first, second, etc.) for overall effectiveness.
1977-78 _____
1978-79 _____
1979-80 _____
1980-81 _____

34) Do you think that the government of Canada should fund programs such as Katimavik?
1) yes
2) no
_____

Why or why not? _____
_____
_____

35) Age _____ _____

36) Sex
1) male
2) female
_____

37) Have you graduated from high school?
1) yes
2) no
_____

38) Have you attended university?
1) yes
2) no
_____

39) Is your home in a city, town or rural environment?

1) city
2) town
3) rural _____

40) In which region is your home?

1) B.C. or Yukon
2) Prairies or NWT
3) Ontario
4) Quebec
5) Atlantic _____

41) In which region do you work?

1) B.C. or Yukon
2) Prairies or NWT
3) Ontario
4) Quebec
5) Atlantic _____

42) What is the most important position in Katimavik apart from the field staff?

_____

43) Are you a

1) group leader
2) co-ordinator

_____

THANK YOU

BIN #B22285 J

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

EFFECTIVENESS

1) Which years were you with Katimavik? 1977-78 _____
1978-79 _____
1979-80 _____
1980-81 _____

2) Which year was the best, in terms of program effectiveness: 1977-78
1978-79
1979-80
1980-81 _____

3) Which year was second best? _____

4) Which year was third best? _____

5) IF REGIONAL STAFF: What has the national office done for you lately? _____

What should they do? _____

What could they do? _____

Make similar comments on the field staff in your region.

How could the operation of your office be improved? _____

6) IF NATIONAL STAFF: Are you satisfied with what the regional offices are doing? 1) yes 2) no _____

What should they do? _____

What could they do? _____

How could the operation of your office or department be improved?

A S C

7) How could Katimavik be improved? _____

_____

_____

8) Do you like working for OPCAN?
1) yes
2) no
_____

9) Are your working conditions etc. acceptable?
1) yes
2) no
_____

Comments: _____

_____

10) Consider your relationships with the sponsors. How could they be improved? _____

_____

11) How could the projects themselves be improved? _____

_____

12) Many hopeful sponsors present proposals which are not accepted. How do they take the news?
1) graciously
2) neutral
3) ungraciously
_____

What do you do to soften the disappointment? _____

_____

13) Is Katimavik well accepted by the townspeople? _____

_____

14) What is the Katimavik concept? _____

_____

15) How could the Katimavik program be put into closer agreement with the Katimavik concept? _____

_____

16) Do you feel that Katimavik meets objectives (personal growth, etc.)?
1) yes
2) no
_____

Comments: _____

_____

17) Are these objectives important?
1) yes
2) no
_____

18) Are there any aspects of Katimavik that make life unnecessarily difficult for you?
1) yes
2) no
_____

IF YES: Explain. _____

_____

19) Do you think that the government of Canada should continue to fund programs such as Katimavik?
1) yes, strongly
2) yes
3) no
4) no, strongly
_____

20) In which office or region do you work?
1) National
2) B.C./Yukon
3) Prairies region
4) Ontario region
5) Quebec region
6) Atlantic region
_____

21) Are you
1) clerical staff
2) executive staff
3) field staff
_____

THANK YOU

BIN #B22285

K

NOTE: 1) This study is sponsored by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of examining the Katimavik program, as directed by the cabinet of the Government of Canada.

2) Participation in this study is voluntary.

COST/BENEFIT SECTION

We hope that you will suggest points for us to consider in doing our economic analysis. Please answer the following questions in that spirit.

1) In your opinion, are there now policies which result in wasted money? E.g. do you lease items for long periods, and end up paying more than the retail cost?

2) Who is responsible for these policies? E.g. regional or national.

3) In the past, were there other policies which wasted money?

4) Suppose that you had a bit more money. What could you accomplish with a small (say 10%) increase in your budget? Please be specific about what you would do, and what it would cost.

5) Suppose now that your budget was reduced by 10%. What would you cut, and how much would each cut save? What would be the impact on your program?

6) Now, suppose you got a 50% budgetary increase. Specifically, what would you spend it on, and what would you accomplish?

7) In a less hypothetical vein, could the number of participants be increased without much increasing overall costs? If so, how?

8) Similarly, could we more fully achieve the goals of Katimavik (service to community, personal growth, environmental awareness, increased understanding) without much increasing costs? If so, how?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR THOUGHTS.

BIN # B22285 A

NOTE: I) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

DIRECTIVES

Les énoncés suivants se présentent par groupes de 10. Lisez chaque groupe rapidement jusqu'au fond, puis reprenez au début et indiquez d'un 1 les trois affirmations qui vous qualifient le mieux. Puis indiquez d'un -1 les trois affirmations qui vous qualifient le moins. Passez ensuite au groupe suivant et recommencez.

Ayez soin d'indiquer exactement trois phrases qui vous ressemblent et trois qui ne vous ressemblent pas.

EXEMPLE

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous êtes apprécié(e) par les hommes comme par les femmes.			col 1-2
2) Vous aimeriez mieux vous amuser qu'être en bonne santé.			col 3-4
3) Vous êtes généreux(se) avec votre argent.			col 5-6
4) Vous n'avez pas beaucoup de bons amis.			col 7-8
5) Tous ceux qui vous connaissent vous font confiance.			col 9-10
6) Vous comptez être politiquement actif(ve) un jour dans votre vie.			col 11-12
7) Vous suspectez tous les hommes d'affaires d'être malhonnêtes.			col 13-14
8) Vous êtes religieux(se) à votre façon.			col 15-16
9) Vous avez toujours été enclin(e) à tempérer les accès de colère.			col 17-18
10) Vous ne vous plaignez pas, vous acceptez les choses, tout simplement.			col 19-20

GROUPE I

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous pouvez influencer les compagnies en achetant avec soin et en engageant des actions de consommateurs.			col 1-2
2) Vous pensez que l'emploi est plus important que l'environnement.			col 3-4
3) Vous ne réagissez jamais excessivement.			col 5-6
4) Vous manquez parfois de sens pratique.			col 7-8
5) Vous avez la réputation d'être digne de confiance.			col 9-10
6) Vous aimeriez fonder votre propre affaire.			col 11-12
7) Vous vous mettez souvent d'accord avec les autres pour éviter une dispute.			col 13-14
8) Vous éprouvez de la difficulté à contrôler un budget.			col 15-16
9) Les discussions sur les pays étrangers vous ennuient.			col 17-18
10) Vous vous attendez à ce que les gens vous aiment.			col 19-20

GROUPE II

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous avez de bons amis d'une autre race ou d'une autre culture.			col 21-22
2) Vous avez généralement le trac quand vous vous adressez à un groupe.			col 23-24
3) Vous êtes partisan(e) de l'entretien préventif, de réparer les choses avant qu'elles ne cassent.			col 25-26
4) Il vous arrive de tout laisser tomber.			col 27-28
5) Vous doutez souvent de "l'avis autorisé".			col 29-30
6) Vous protégeriez l'environnement même si c'était plus cher.			col 31-32
7) Vous voulez que les injustices sociales soient corrigées, mais pas toutes à la fois.			col 33-34
8) Vous aimez travailler de vos mains.			col 35-36
9) Vous êtes très prudent(e).			col 37-38
10) Vous avez mauvais caractère.			col 39-40

GROUPE III

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous êtes plus insouciant(e) qu'organisé(e).			col 41-42
2) Vous trouvez nécessaire de temps en temps d'être seul(e).			col 43-44
3) Vous ne craignez pas de vous battre pour le respect de vos droits.			col 45-46
4) Vous préféreriez avoir assez d'énergie, sans tenir compte de la pollution.			col 47-48
5) Vous préféreriez ne pas travailler à la commission.			col 49-50
6) Vous étiez rarement discipliné(e) à l'école.			col 51-52
7) Vous faites généralement bonne impression sur les étrangers.			col 53-54
8) Vous prenez soin de votre apparence.			col 55-56
9) Vous n'êtes jamais débordé(e) à la dernière minute.			col 57-58
10) Vous préférez parler à des gens provenant du même milieu socio-économique.			col 59-60

GROUPE IV

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous préférez organiser mentalement l'information plutôt que de la mettre sur du papier.			col 61-62
2) Vous maintenez vos opinions, même quand vous savez qu'elles sont erronées.			col 63-64
3) Vous arrivez à travailler selon un horaire précis.			col 65-66
4) Il vous arrive de vous battre (physiquement).			col 67-68
5) Vous pensez que le risque fait tout simplement partie de la vie.			col 69-70
6) Vous êtes pour le bilinguisme.			col 71-72
7) Vous pensez que beaucoup de problèmes sociaux ne peuvent pas être résolus.			col 73-74
8) Il vous est important de faire partie d'un groupe.			col 75-76
9) Vous détestez les longues discussions qui portent sur des détails.			col 77-78
10) Vous êtes pour Greenpeace.			col 79-80

ASK

GROUPE V

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous aimeriez faire du parachutisme ou de l'aile delta.			col 1-2
2) Vous êtes facile à vivre.			col 3-4
3) Vous n'aimez pas le contact avec les étrangers.			col 5-6
4) Vous aimeriez mieux ne pas rencontrer les "petits hommes verts" de l'espace.			col 7-8
5) Vous trouvez souvent des solutions en laissant les points délicats se résoudre d'eux-mêmes.			col 9-10
6) Vous détester prendre la responsabilité d'une tâche.			col 11-12
7) Vous pensez que le gouvernement devrait se préoccuper davantage de l'environnement.			col 13-14
8) Vous aimez organiser les choses à l'avance.			col 15-16
9) Vous considérez généralement comme vrai ce que vous lisez dans les journaux.			col 17-18
10) Vous avez peu de contrôle sur votre avenir.			col 19-20

GROUPE VI

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous connaissez vos faiblesses.			col 21-22
2) Vous pensez que la comptabilité est une chose idiote.			col 23-24
3) Ou bien on vous aime, ou bien on vous déteste.			col 25-26
4) Vous pensez que le Canada devrait avoir une politique d'immigration plus libérale.			col 27-28
5) Vous intimidez souvent ceux qui ne sont pas d'accord avec vous.			col 29-30
6) Vous pensez que nous pourrions vaincre la pollution si nous le voulions vraiment.			col 31-32
7) Vous rêvassez souvent.			col 33-34
8) Vous ne vous recyclerez pas quand vous quitterez Katimavik.			col 35-36
9) Vous aimez les tâches administratives.			col 37-38
10) Vous n'aimez pas les films ou les romans d'aventure.			col 39-40

ASK

GROUPE VII

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous êtes de l'avis que certaines lois, par exemple celles qui interdisent de marcher sur la chaussée, sont idiotes.			col 41-42
2) Vous adorez voyager.			col 43-44
3) Il vous arrive de lancer des objets quand vous êtes en colère.			col 45-46
4) Vous êtes compétent(e) dans presque tout ce que vous entreprenez.			col 47-48
5) Vous pouvez vous amuser dans un jeu, même si vous attrapez quelques bleus.			col 49-50
6) Vous détestez les dates limites.			col 51-52
7) Vous vous sentez impuissant(e) à changer la politique du gouvernement.			col 53-54
8) Vous ne voulez pas être un(e) dirigeant(e).			col 55-56
9) Vous êtes préoccupé(e) par le problème de la contamination de la pluie (acid rain).			col 57-58
10) Vous croyez que la fin ne justifie pas les moyens.			col 59-60

GROUPE VIII

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Il vous arrive de jeter des détritus dans la rue.			col 61-62
2) Vous avez envisagé une carrière dans l'ingénierie.			col 63-64
3) Vous vous faites du souci à propos de votre capacité à bien fonctionner dans des situations nouvelles.			col 65-66
4) Vous vous mettez rarement en colère.			col 67-68
5) Vous êtes d'accord que "Il vaut mieux tenir que courir."			col 69-70
6) Vous modifiez parfois votre comportement pour mieux conformer à celui de vos pairs.			col 71-72
7) Vous êtes intolérant(e) envers les étrangers.			col 73-74
8) Vous vous réjouissez de bénéfices que peut apporter l'exploration de l'espace.			col 75-76
9) Vous ne faites jamais faire votre travail par quelqu'un d'autre.			col 77-78
10) Vous êtes ponctuel(le).			col 79-80

GROUPE IX

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous contrôlez facilement vos désirs.			col 1-2
2) Vous ne prêtez pas l'attention aux mises en garde contre la cancer et autres dangers pour la santé.			col 3-4
3) Vous voulez faire avancer la tolérance sociale.			col 5-6
4) Vous pensez que les mystiques orientaux sont ridicules.			col 7-8
5) Vous ne parlez pas beaucoup en groupe.			col 9-10
6) Vous ratez souvent l'autobus.			col 11-12
7) Vous achevez tout ce que vous entreprenez.			col 13-14
8) Vous trouvez le rythme actuel du changement technologique passionnant.			col 15-16
9) Vous ne croyez pas que le niveau actuel de la pollution soit dangereux.			col 17-18
10) Vous aimez argumenter et discuter.			col 19-20

GROUPE X

	-1 qualifie le moins	1 qualifie le mieux	NE RIEN ECRIRE ICI
1) Vous êtes plus intéressé(e) par ce qui marche que par la théorie.			col 21-22
2) L'incertitude vous gêne.			col 23-24
3) Vous méprisez le Ku Klux Klan.			col 25-26
4) Vous avez envisagé une carrière dans l'administration.			col 27-28
5) Vous respectez toujours l'autorité.			col 29-30
6) Vous avez quelquefois envie de démissionner de la race humaine.			col 31-32
7) Vous devenez parfois très émotif(ve) dans des situations graves.			col 33-34
8) Les gens qui jettent des détritus n'importe où vous tapent sur les nerfs.			col 35-36
9) Vous n'êtes pas trop concerné(e) par l'opinion qu'ont les autres de vous.			col 37-38
10) Vous détestez faire des heures supplémentaires pour quelque raison que ce soit.			col 39-40

BIN # B22285 B

Notez: 1) Cette étude est présentée par le secrétaire d'Etat, pour examiner le programme Katimavik, selon les instructions du cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude est facultative.

QUESTIONNAIRE DU PARTICIPANT

DIRECTIVES: Inscrivez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse sur la ligne attenante. Ne tenez aucun compte de "col 1" . . . "col 43-44," etc. Nous avons mis "col 1" dans la marge uniquement pour simplifier l'existence des mécanographes. Prenez votre temps.

1) **Les projets Katimavik (sur lesquels vous avez travaillé) sont-ils utiles à la communauté d'accueil?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 1

2) **Avez-vous personnellement aidé à construire quelque chose dans ce projet?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 2

3) **Vos habitudes de travail se sont-elles améliorées en général depuis que vous avez participé à Katimavik?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 3

4) **Vous sentez-vous plus en forme qu'avant votre participation à Katimavik?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 4

5) Allez-vous continuer à mener

a) une vie physique active? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 5

b) une vie intellectuelle active? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 6

6) Avez-vous l'intention d'aller à l'Université? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 7

7) **Avez-vous développé des connaissances utiles à Katimavik?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 8

8) **Utilisez-vous des techniques d'économie d'énergie dans les projets?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 9

9) **Avez-vous appris à utiliser des techniques appropriées à l'environnement?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 10

10) **Etes-vous plus autonome qu'avant votre participation à Katimavik?** 1) oui 2) non _____ col 11

11) Katimavik vous a-t-il enseigné quelque chose qui vous sera utile lorsque vous chercherez du travail? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 12

Si oui: Quoi? _____

_____

12) Etes-vous maintenant mieux équipé(e) pour vivre dans une société aux ressources naturelles limitées?
1) oui
2) non
col 13

13) Vous proposerez-vous pour d'autres services communautaires quand vous quitterez Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 14

14) Est-ce qu'il y avait une bonne attitude de coopération au travail?
1) oui
2) non
col 15

15) Est-ce qu'il y avait une bonne attitude de coopération dans la vie de groupe?
1) oui
2) non
col 16

16) Votre groupe a-t-il un bon sens de la solidarité?
1) oui
2) non
col 17

17) Combien des lieux suivants sont représentés par des membres de votre groupe de 11 participants?

T.N.-O ou Yukon
Colombie-Britannique
Prairies
Ontario
Québec
Maritimes
Terre-Neuve (1,2,3,4,5,6,7)

col 18

18) Les autres membres de votre groupe de onze proviennent-ils tous du même milieu socio-économique?
1) oui
2) non
col 19

19) Votre groupe fait-il preuve de plus d'auto-discipline que lorsque vous avez commencé?
1) oui
2) non
col 20

20) Faites-vous preuve de plus d'auto-discipline que quand vous avez commencé Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 21

21) Avez-vous de meilleures habitudes alimentaires que quand vous avez commencé à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 22

22) Vous connaissez-vous mieux que lorsque vous avez débuté à Katimivak?
1) oui
2) non
col 23

23) Etes-vous maintenant plus conscient(e) des problèmes de la société?
1) oui
2) non
col 24

24) Voulez-vous aider à résoudre ces problèmes?
1) oui
2) non
col 25

25) Etes-vous plus au courant des événements d'actualité régionale?
1) plus
2) pareil
3) moins
col 26

26) Etes-vous plus au courant des événements d'actualité politique?
1) plus
2) pareil
3) moins
col 27

27) Avez-vous une idée plus claire de ce que vous voulez faire dans la vie? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 28

28) Parliez-vous déjà les deux langues officielles couramment avant de participer à Katimavik? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 29

SI NON: a) parlez-vous maintenant plus couramment l'autre langue officielle qu'avant? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 30

b) Possédez-vous maintenant une connaissance pratique de l'autre langue officielle? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 31

29) Katimavik est-il bien accepté par les citoyens de la communauté? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 32

30) Vous sentez-vous étranger(ère) ou proche des autre canadiens? 1) étranger(ère) 2) proche _____ col 33

31) Certains de vos agents de groupe ont-ils été renvoyés? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 34

32) Certains de vos agents de groupe sont-ils partis volontairement? Combien? (0,1,2) _____ col 35

33) Avez-vous déjà participé à des programmes similaires à Katimavik? Combien de fois? (0,1,2) _____ col 36

34) Avez-vous déjà participé à votre projet francophone? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 37

35) Le Katimavik a des projets dans les deux langues officielles. Est-ce une bonne idée? 1) oui 2) non _____ col 38

36) Quel genre d'emploi aimeriez-vous obtenir? _____

_____

_____

37) Quel genre d'emploi refuseriez-vous? _____

_____

_____

38) Vous avez fourni un travail manuel considérable à Katimavik. Quelle proportion de ce travail a eu un effet durable sur la communauté?

1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 25%

_____ col 39

39) Quel pourcentage de ce travail manuel a été très valable?

1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 50%

col 40

40) Avez-vous déjà fait un travail qui a profité à l'industrie privée?

1) oui
2) non

col 41

41) Etes-vous arrivé(e) à connaître les communautés dans lesquelles les projets étaient situés?

1) très bien
2) un peu
3) pas beaucoup

col 42

42) Si vous pouviez tout recommencer, sachant ce que vous savez de Katimavik, choisiriez-vous d'y adhérer de nouveau?

1) oui
2) peut-être
3) non

col 43

43) Recommanderiez-vous Katimavik à un(e) ami(e)?

1) oui
2) non

col 44

44) Pourquoi vous êtes-vous inscrit(e) à Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

45) Qu'est-ce que vous aimez le plus dans Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

46) Qu'est-ce que vous aimez le moins? _____

_____

_____

_____

47) Quelle est la chose la plus importante que vous ayez acquise à Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

_____

AUTRES COMMENTAIRES _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

48) Age

col 45-46

49) Sexe

1) masculin
2) féminin

col 47

50) Avez-vous un diplôme de l'école secondaire?

1) oui
2) non

col 48

51) Venez-vous d'une grande ville, d'une petite ville, ou d'une communauté rurale?

1) grande ville
2) petite ville
3) communauté rurale

col 49

52) De quelle région venez-vous?

1) T.N.-O ou Yukon
2) C.-B.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Québec
6) Maritimes ou Terre-Neuve

col 50

53) Quelle est votre langue de préférence?

1) français
2) anglais

col 51

OPTION MILITAIRE

54) Pourquoi avez-vous choisi l'option militaire? _____

_____

_____

_____

55) Choisiriez-vous de nouveau l'option militaire?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 52

56) La recommanderiez-vous à un(e) ami(e)?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 53

57) Quelle était votre opinion de l'armée canadienne avant votre adhésion au Katimavik?
1) bonne
2) indifférente
3) médiocre
_____ col 54

58) Quelle est maintenant votre opinion de l'armée canadienne?
1) meilleure
2) la même
3) pire
_____ col 55

59) Pourrait-on faire quelque chose pour améliorer l'option militaire?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 56

SI OUI: Quoi? _____

_____

_____

_____

60) Autant que vous sachiez, quelles ont été les réactions des officiers réguliers de la base envers Katimavik?
1) favorables
2) neutres
3) défavorables
_____ col 57

61) Est-ce qu'il était difficile de s'adapter d'un projet civil à un projet militaire et vice-versa?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 58

BIN #22285 C

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

TEST DE CONVERSATION EN FRANCAIS

INSTRUCTIONS:

L'interviewer commencera l'entrevue par les formules de politesse d'usage (Comment allez-vous aujourd'hui, etc.) pour se faire une idée quant aux connaissances minimales du sujet dans la langue seconde.

Si le sujet est incapable de répondre dans la langue seconde, l'entrevue aura lieu dans la langue maternelle. Dans ce cas, la compréhension ne pourra être évaluée avec précision.

Pour certaines questions il sera impossible d'évaluer l'utilisation du langage (par exemple, lorsqu'une réponse est seulement oui ou non). Dans ce cas le code à inscrire sera 0.

L'évaluation de chaque catégorie de l'utilisation du langage se fera selon une échelle de compétence de 1 à 3 comme suit:

1- réponse juste

2- réponse pas tout à fait juste, mais le contexte ou quelques précisions supplémentaires la rendent compréhensible

3- réponse inexacte, incompréhensible; beaucoup de précisions supplémentaires seraient nécessaires pour comprendre

1
Col 1

L'entrevue a lieu en

1) langue maternelle
2) langue seconde

Col 2

Depuis combien d'années étudiez-vous le français?

Col 3

Y a-t-il quelqu'un chez vous qui parle une langue autre que l'anglais?

1) non
2) le français
3) autre

Col 4

Chez vous, parlez-vous une langue autre que l'anglais?

1) non
2) le français
3) autre

Col 5

1) Aimez-vous le programme ici (à _____)?

1) oui
2) non

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Col 6

2) Avez-vous aimé le programme (à _____)?

1) beaucoup
2) il me laisse indifférent
3) je le déteste

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Col 7

3) Comment le premier stage vous a-t-il plu?

1) beaucoup
2) il me laisse indifférent(e)
3) je le déteste

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Col 8

4) Est-ce que les buts (les objectifs) du programme Katimavik vous plaisent? Comment?

1) beaucoup
2) ils me laissent indifférent(e)
3) je les déteste

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Col 9

5) Quels sont les objectifs du programme Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

6) Est-ce que le programme pourrait être plus en accord avec ses objectifs?

1) oui
2) non

Col 10

Comment/Pourquoi? _____

_____

_____

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

7) Avez-vous déjà pensé à quitter Katimavik?

1) oui
2) non

Col 11

Si oui: Pourquoi? _____

_____

_____

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

8) Est-ce que quelqu'un de votre groupe a quitté Katimavik?

1) participant
2) agent de groupe
3) personne

Col 12

Si oui: Avez-vous trouvé cette personne sympathique?

1) oui
2) indifférent(e)
3) non

Col 13

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Si oui: Pourquoi l'a-t-il (elle) abandonné?

_____

_____

9) A-t-on déjà mis quelqu'un de votre groupe à la porte?

1) participant
2) agent de groupe
3) personne

Col 14

Si oui: L'avez-vous trouvé(e) sympathique?

1) oui
2) indifférent(e)
3) non

Col 15

Pourquoi l'a-t-on congédié(e)?

_____

_____

_____

Avez-vous trouvé cette action raisonnable?

1) oui
2) non

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Col 16

10) Que faut-il faire pour réussir dans le programme Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

11) Pourrait-on améliorer Katimavik?

1) C'est possible
2) Ce n'est pas possible

Col 17

Comment? _____

_____

_____

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

12) Etes-vous content(e) des projets de travail? 1) oui
2) non

Col 18

Si non: Comment pourrait-on les améliorer?

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

13) Etes-vous satisfait(e) des chefs de groupes et du coordinateur? 1) oui
2) non

Col 19

Oui/non: Pourquoi?

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

14) Aimez-vous la/les communauté(s) où vous avez travaillé? 1) oui
2) elle(s) me laisse(ent) indifférent(e)
3) non

Col 20

Pourquoi?

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

15) Trouvez-vous satisfaisants les logements et la nourriture? 1) oui
2) non

Col 21

Oui/non: Pourquoi?

UTILISATION DU LANGAGE:
- compréhension
- l'ordre des mots
- accord des participes passés; des adjectifs
- utilisation des prépositions
- bonne forme du verbe

Evaluation du bon usage des idiotismes. _____ col 22

Evaluation des articles. _____ col 23

Evaluation du bon usage du comparatif. _____ col 24

Evaluation du bon temps du verbe. _____ col 25

Evaluation de la bonne façon de lier les phrases les unes aux autres. _____ col 26

L'utilisation des meilleures tournures et les expressions appropriées. _____ col 27

Evaluation de la prononciation _____ col 28

Evaluation de la compréhension _____ col 29

BIN #22285 D

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE DU GRADUE

NOM: _____

ADRESSE: _____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE: _____

DIRECTIVES: Inscrivez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse sur la ligne attenante. Ne tenez aucun compte de "col 1" . . . "col 43-44," etc. Nous avons mis "col 1" dans la marge uniquement pour simplifier l'existence des mécanographes. Prenez votre temps.

1) Les projets Katimavik (sur lesquels vous avez travaillé) ont-ils été utiles à la communauté d'accueil?
1) oui
2) non
col 1

2) Avez-vous personnellement aidé à construire quelque chose dans un projet Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 2

3) Vos habitudes de travail en général se sont-elles améliorées à cause de Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 3

4) Vous sentez-vous plus en forme qu'avant votre participation à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 4

5) Allez-vous continuer à mener

a) une vie physique active
1) oui
2) non
col 5

b) une vie intellectuelle active
1) oui
2) non
col 6

6) Avez-vous fréquenté l'université?
1) oui
2) non
col 7

7) Avez-vous développé des connaissances utiles à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 8

8) Avez-vous utilisé des techniques d'économie d'énergie dans les projets?
1) oui
2) non
col 9

9) Avez-vous appris à utiliser des techniques appropriées à l'environnement?
1) oui
2) non
col 10

10) Etes-vous plus indépendant(e) qu'avant votre participation à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 11

11) Katimavik vous a-t-il enseigné quelque chose qui vous a été utile quand vous avez cherché du travail?
1) oui
2) non
col 12

12) Etes-vous maintenant mieux équipé(e) pour vivre dans une société aux ressources naturelles limitées?
1) oui
2) non
col 13

13) Vous êtes-vous proposé(e) pour d'autres services communautaires après avoir quitté Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 14

14) Tout le monde travaillait-il en bonne association à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 15

15) Tout le monde vivait-il en bonne association à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 16

16) Votre groupe avait-il un bon sens de la solidarité?
1) oui
2) non
col 17

17) Combien des lieux suivants étaient représentés par les membres de votre groupe de onze personnes?
T.N.-O. ou Yukon
C.-B.
Prairies
Ontario
Québec
Maritimes
Terre-Neuve
(1,2,3,4,5,6 ou 7)
col 18

18) Les autres membres de votre groupe de onze provenaient-ils tous du même milieu socio-économique?
1) oui
2) non
col 19

19) Votre groupe a-t-il acquis plus d'auto-discipline que quand vous avez commencé?
1) oui
2) non
col 20

20) Faites-vous preuve de plus d'auto-discipline que quand vous avez commencé à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 21

21) Avez-vous de meilleures habitudes alimentaires que quand vous avez commencé à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 22

22) Vous connaissez-vous mieux que quand vous avez débuté à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 23

23) Etes-vous maintenant plus conscient(e) des problèmes de la société?
1) oui
2) non
col 24

24) Voulez-vous aider à résoudre ces problèmes?
1) oui
2) non
col 25

25) Etes-vous plus au courant des événements d'actualité régionale?
1) oui
2) non
col 26

26) Etes-vous plus au courant des événements d'actualité politique?
1) oui
2) non
col 27

27) Avez-vous une idée claire de ce que vous voulez faire dans la vie?
1) oui
2) non
col 28

28) Parliez-vous déjà les deux langues officielles couramment avant de participer à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 29

SI NON: a) parlez-vous plus couramment l'autre langue officielle maintenant qu'avant?
1) oui
2) non
col 30

b) possédez-vous maintenant une connaissance pratique de l'autre langue officielle?
1) oui
2) non
col 31

29) Pensez-vous qu'il est important d'être exposé à l'autre langue officielle?
1) oui
2) non
col 32

30) Katimavik a-t-il généralement été accepté par les citoyens de la communauté?
1) accepté par la plupart
2) accepté par quelques-uns
3) accepté par personne
col 33

31) Vous sentez-vous personnellement étranger(e) ou proche des autres Canadiens?
1) différent(e)
2) proche
col 34

32) Katimavik prépare les gens à vivre dans un monde aux ressources naturelles limitées. Avez-vous eu de la difficulté à vous adapter à nouveau à une société d'abondance?
1) oui
2) non
col 35

33) Certains de vos agents de groupe ont-ils été renvoyés? renvoyés?
1) oui
2) non
col 36

SI OUI: Pourquoi? _____

_____

34) Certains de vos agents de groupe ont-ils démissionné? Combien? (0,1,2, etc.)
col 37

35) Aviez-vous déjà participé à des programmes comme Katimavik? Combien de fois? (0,1,2, etc.)
col 38

Enumérez ces programmes: _____

_____

36) Avez-vous travaillé dans un projet francophone?
1) oui
2) non
col 39

37) Katimavik a des projets dans des communautés anglophones et francophones. Est-ce une bonne idée?
1) oui
2) non
col 40

38) Qu'avez-vous comme emploi maintenant? _____

_____

_____

39) Quels genres d'emplois refuseriez-vous? _____

_____

_____

40) Vous intéressez-vous à la politique?
1) oui
2) non
col 41

41) Appartenez-vous à un parti politique?
1) oui
2) non
col 42

42) Avez-vous participé à une campagne d'élection?
1) oui
2) non
col 43

43) Etes-vous toujours ami(e) avec d'autres participants à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 44

44) Combien de fois par an faites-vous plus de 100 km pour visiter vos amis de Katimavik?
col 44-45

45) Voyez-vous toujours vos amis d'avant Katimavik autant qu'autrefois?
1) oui
2) non
col 46

46) Etes-vous plus intime avec vos amis de Katimavik qu'avec vos autres amis?
1) oui
2) non
col 47

Commentez: _____

_____

_____

47) Aimez-vous le concept Katimavik?
1) beaucoup
2) assez
3) sans opinion
4) je ne l'aime pas
5) je le déteste
col 48

48. Quel est le concept Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

49) Pourrait-on mettre les projets Katimavik en meilleure harmonie avec le concept de Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
col 49

Comment? _____

_____

_____

50) Avez-vous jamais envisagé de quitter Katimavik?

1) jamais
2) pas sérieusement
3) oui, sérieusement
4) oui, j'ai failli le faire
5) je l'ai fait

col 50

SI OUI: Pourquoi? _____

_____

_____

51) Quelqu'un de votre groupe a-t-il abandonné Katimavik? 1) oui 2) non

col 51

SI OUI: l'aimiez-vous?

col 52

SI DEUX ABANDONS: aimiez-vous cette deuxième personne?

col 53

SI TROIS ABANDONS: aimiez-vous cette troisième personne?

col 54

SI QUATRE ABANDONS: aimiez-vous cette quatrième personne?

col 55

SI OUI: Pourquoi ont-ils (elles) abandonné? _____

_____

52) Quelqu'un de votre groupe a-t-il été renvoyé? 1) oui 2) non

col 56

SI OUI: l'aimiez-vous? 1) oui 2) sans opinion 3) non

col 57

Pourquoi a-t-il (elle) été renvoyé(e)? _____

_____

Pensez-vous que c'était justifiable? 1) oui 2) non

col 58

53) Que faut-il pour faire de Katimavik un succès? _____

_____

54) Comment pourrait-on améliorer Katimavik? _____

_____

1) possible
2) impossible

col 59

55) Etiez-vous satisfait(e) des projets? 1) oui 2) non

col 60

SI OUI/
SI NON: Comment pourrait-on les améliorer? _____

_____

56) Etiez-vous satisfait(e) du chef de groupe et du (de la) coordinateur(trice)?
1) oui
2) non
col 61

SI OUI: Pourquoi?
SI NON: Pourquoi? _____

_____

57) Aimiez-vous les communautés dans lesquelles vous avez travaillé?
1) oui
2) sans opinion
3) non
col 62

Pourquoi? _____

_____

58) Etiez-vous satisfait(e) des conditions de vie?
1) oui
2) non
col 63

59) Si vous pouviez tout recommencer, sachant ce que vous savez de Katimavik, choisiriez-vous d'y participer à nouveau?
1) oui
2) peut-être
3) non
col 64

60) Recommanderiez-vous Katimavik à un(e) ami(e)?
1) oui
2) non
col 65

61) Pourquoi avez-vous participé à Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

62) Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît le plus dans Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

63) Qu'est-ce que vous aimez le moins? _____

_____

_____

(64) Quelle est la chose la plus importante que vous ayez acquise à Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

AUTRES COMMENTAIRES _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

65) Vous avez fourni un travail manuel considérable à Katimavik. Quelle proportion de ce travail a eu un effet durable sur la communauté?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 25%
col 66-67

66) Quel pourcentage de ce travail physique fut très valable?
1) 75 - 100%
2) 50 - 75%
3) 25 - 50%
4) 0 - 50%
col 68-69

67) Avez-vous déjà fait un travail qui a profité à l'entreprise privée?
1) oui
2) non
col 70

68) Ecoutez-vous la radio ou regardez-vous la télévision dans l'autre langue officielle?
1) oui
2) non
3) non disponible
col 71

69) Utilisez-vous souvent l'autre langue officielle?
1) tous les jours
2) toutes les semaines
3) rarement
4) jamais
col 72

70) Dans quelle mesure etes-vous arrivé(e) à connaître les communautés dans lesquelles les projets étaient situés?
1) très bien
2) un peu
3) pas beaucoup
col 73

71) Age
col 74

72) Sexe
1) masculin
2) féminin
col 75

73) Avez-vous un diplôme de l'école secondaire?
1) oui
2) non
col 76

74) Venez-vous d'une grande ville, d'une petite ville, ou d'une communauté rurale?
1) grande ville
2) petite ville
3) environnement rural
col 77

75) De quelle région venez-vous?
1) T.N.-O ou Yukon
2) C.-B.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Québec
6) Maritimes ou Terre-Neuve
col 78

76) En quelle année avez-vous participé à Katimavik?
1) 1977 - 78
2) 1978 - 79
3) 1979 - 80
4) 1980 - 81
col 79

77) Quelle est votre langue d'usage?
1) français
2) anglais

OPTION MILITAIRE

78) Pourquoi avez-vous choisi l'option militaire? _____

_____

_____

_____

79) La choisiriez-vous encore?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 1

80) La recommanderiez-vous à un(e) ami(e)?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 2

81) Quelle était votre opinion générale de l'armée avant de participer?
1) bonne
2) indifférente
3) mauvaise
_____ col 3

82) Quelle est maintenant votre opinion de l'armée canadienne?
1) meilleure
2) la même
3) pire
_____ col 4

83) Pourrait-on faire quelque chose pour améliorer l'option militaire?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 5

Quoi? _____

_____

_____

84) Autant que vous sachiez, quelles ont été les réactions des officiers de carrière de la base envers Katimavik?
1) favorables
2) neutres
3) défavorables
_____ col 6

85) Etait-il difficile de s'adapter du projet civil au projet militaire et vice-versa?
1) oui
2) non
_____ col 7

Si oui, comment? Qu'aurait-on pu faire? _____

_____

BIN B22285 E

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

NOM _____

ADRESSE _____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE _____

1) Quand vous avez quitté Katimavik, était-ce pour

1) raisons médicales
2) raisons personnelles
3) cause de renvoi

col 1

2) Comment cela s'est-il produit? Qu'est-ce qui a causé votre départ? _____

_____

_____

3) a) SI RENVOYE(E): Pensez-vous que votre renvoi était justifiable?

1) oui
2) non

col 2

b) Qu'est-ce que cela vous fait d'être renvoyé?

_____ col 3

_____

_____

c) Donc, vous (ne) vous sentez (pas) amer

1) amer (ère)
2) pas amer (ère)

col 4

4) Comment votre départ aurait-il pu être évité? _____

_____

_____

_____

5) Qu'avez-vous acquis à Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

6) Comment pourrait-on améliorer Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

_____

BIN #B22285 F

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

DIRECTIVES: Entourez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse.
Merci de nous consacrer votre temps.

1) Les participants à Katimavik étaient-ils dignes de confiance lorsque laissés seuls?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

2) Les participants avaient-ils en général une attitude positive?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

3) Les participants ont-ils fait du travail de bonne qualité?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

4) Avez-vous été capable de remplir vos engagements envers Katimavik en ce qui concerne
a) le matériel 1) oui 2) non
b) le travail 1) oui 2) non
c) la supervision du travail 1) oui 2) non

5) Les participants ont-ils travaillé suffisamment dur?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

Evaluez le nombre d'heures par semaine: _____

6) Le projet a-t-il été achevé à la date prévue?
1) oui
2) non
3) pas applicable

7) Qu'ont-ils construit? _____

_____

_____

8) Jusqu'à ce jour, combien a couté approximativement le matériel pour chacune de ces choses?

_____

_____

9) Environ quelle quantité de ce matériel a été fournie par Katimavik?

10) Quelles en étaient exactement les dispositions? (ex: frais de location)

11) Approximativement combien de hommes/semaines ont été passées dans chacun de ces projets de construction?

12) Les participants avaient-ils bonne apparence?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

Commentez:

13) Les participants étaient-ils suffisamment préparés pour leur tâche?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

14) Votre organisation a-t-elle tiré profit de Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non

15) Les participants à Katimavik semblaient-ils tirer profit de l'expérience?
1) la plupart
2) certains
3) quelques-uns

16) Avez-vous des critiques à faire à l'endroit de Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non

17) Katimavik a-t-il bien réagi à vos critiques?
1) oui
2) non
3) pas applicable

18) Travailleriez-vous de nouveau avec Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non

19) Globalement, quelle est votre évaluation de Katimavik?
1) bien
2) assez bien
3) médiocre

20) Si vous avez travaillé avec Katimavik pendant plus d'une année, classez ces années (première, seconde, etc.) d'après leur efficacité globale.

1977 - 1978_____
1978 - 1979_____
1979 - 1980_____
1980 - 1981_____

21) Approuvez-vous que le gouvernement soutienne des programmes comme Katimavik?

1) oui
2) non

22) Comment pourrait-on améliorer Katimavik? _____

_____

_____

23) Dans quelle région votre projet est-il situé?

1) C.-B. ou Yukon
2) Prairies et T.N.-O.
3) Ontario
4) Québec
5) Atlantique

BIN #B22285 G

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'État dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

DIRECTIVES: Entourez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse.
Merci de nous consacrer votre temps.

1) Katimavik a accompli un service communautaire dans votre communauté pendant les quatre dernières années.
Connaisez-vous Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non

2) Qu'est-ce que le groupe Katimavik a accompli? (Veuillez être aussi précis que possible.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

3) Le groupe Katimavik a-t-il construit quelque chose?
1) oui
2) non

4) Qu'ont-ils construit?_____

_____

_____

5) Est-ce utile?
1) très utile
2) utile
3) pas utile
4) complètement inutile

6) Est-ce que Katimavik vous a rendu plus conscient des divers groupes ethniques qui composent notre pays?
1) oui
2) non

7) Katimavik vous a-t-il permis de mieux connaître les techniques d'économie d'énergie, le recyclage ou la protection de l'environnement?
1) oui
2) non

8) Le groupe Katimavik se conduisait-il correctement?
1) oui
2) non
3) je ne sais pas

9) Aimeriez-vous voir Katimavik revenir dans votre communauté?
1) oui
2) non
3) je ne sais pas

10) Croyez-vous que les participants ont tiré profit de Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non
3) je ne sais pas

11) Est-ce qu'il y a des participants de Katimavik qui sont restés dans votre région communautaire pour accepter un emploi?
1) oui
2) non

Si oui, combien? _____

En quelle(s) année(s) ont-ils été embauchés?
1) 1978
2) 1979
3) 1980

Quelle phrase décrit le mieux leur genre de travail?
1) main-d'oeuvre non spécialisée
2) main-d'oeuvre semi spécialisée
3) main-d'oeuvre spécialisée
4) semi-professionnel

12) Globalement, pensez-vous que Katimavik atteint ses buts de service envers la communauté d'accueil, de développement personnel de ses participants, et d'accroissement du sentiment de connaissance de la diversité et de l'environnement du Canada?

1) oui
2) non

13) Si vous avez été en contact avec Katimavik pendant plus d'un an, classez ces années (première, deuxième, etc.) d'après leur efficacité globale.

1977 - 1978_____
1978 - 1979_____
1979 - 1980_____
1980 - 1981_____

14) On devrait peut-être faire également d'autres choses dans votre communauté. Énumérez ces choses que le gouvernement devrait faire.

_____

_____

_____

15) Combien de celles-ci sont plus importantes que ce que Katimavik a fait? (0, 1, 2, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

16) Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada devrait financer des programmes comme ceux-ci?

1) oui
2) non

Pourquoi oui ou pourquoi non?_____

_____

Avez-vous des remarques à faire sur Katimavik?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17) De quelle région êtes-vous originaire?

1) C.-B.
2) Prairies
3) Ontario
4) Québec
5) Atlantique

18) Quand avez-vous déménagé où vous résidez maintenant?

MERCI

BIN #22285 H

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE DU CANDIDAT

NOM: _____

ADRESSE: _____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE: _____

DIRECTIVES: Inscrivez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse sur la ligne attenante. Ne tenez aucun compte de "col 1" . . . "col 43-44," etc. Nous avons mis "col 1" dans la marge uniquement pour simplifier l'existence des mécanographes. Prenez votre temps.

1) En quelle année vous êtes vous inscrit?

1) 1977 - 1978
2) 1978 - 1979
3) 1979 - 1980
4) 1980 - 1981

col 1

2) Quand avez-vous appris que vous n'aviez pas été accepté(e)?

3) Dans quelle mesure étiez vous déçu de ne pas avoir été accepté(e)?

1) très déçu
2) déçu
3) pas déçu

col 2

4) Qu'avez-vous fait à la place de Katimavik? _____

_____

5) Etait-ce un substitut convenable à Katimavik?

1) mieux que Katimavik
2) convenable
3) pas convenable

col 3

6) Katimavik a-t-il été poli et raisonnable en vous annonçant la nouvelle?

1) oui
2) non

col 4

Commentaires _____

_____

_____

7) Age

col 5-6

8) Sexe

1) masculin
2) féminin

col 7

9) Etes-vous diplômé(e) de l'école secondaire ou du Cegep?

1) oui
2) non

col 8

10) Avez-vous fréquenté l'université?

1) oui
2) non

col 9

11) Avez-vous fréquenté une école professionnelle?

1) oui
2) non

col 10

12) Etes-vous en cours de formation?

1) oui
2) non

col 11

12) Etes-vous originaire d'une grande ville, d'une petite ville, ou d'une communauté rurale.

1) grande ville
2) petite ville
3) environnement rural

col 12

13) De quelle région êtes-vous originaire?

1) T.N.-O. ou Yukon
2) C.-B.
3) Prairies
4) Ontario
5) Québec
6) Maritimes
7) Terre-Neuve

col 13

BIN #22285 I

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE DU PERSONNEL DE TERRAIN

DIRECTIVES: Inscrivez le numéro correspondant à votre réponse sur la ligne attenante. Ces questions sont celles que nous avons eu l'idée de poser. Si vous le voulez, écrivez un roman. Nous le lirons.

1) Les projets Katimavik (sur lesquels vous avez travaillé) sont-ils nécessaires à la communauté d'accueil?
1) oui
2) non _____

2) Utilisez-vous des techniques d'économie d'énergie dans les projets?
1) oui
2) non _____

3) Etes-vous compétent(e) dans d'autres techniques appropriées à l'environement?
1) oui
2) non _____

4) Vos participants et vous vivez-vous et travaillez-vous vraiment en équipe à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non _____

5) Vos participants et vous avez-vous le sens de la solidarité?
1) oui
2) non _____

6) Votre groupe (et ses participants) fait-il preuve de plus d'auto-discipline que quand vous avez commencé Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non _____

7) L'un des buts de Katimavik est d'aider le développement des participants. Avez-vous fait l'expérience d'un développement personnel vous aussi?
1) oui
2) non _____

8) Est-ce que Katimavik vous a rendu plus conscient de l'existence des différents groupes ethniques qui composent notre pays?
1) oui
2) non _____

9) Parliez-vous déjà les deux langues officielles couramment avant de participer à Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non _____

SI NON: a) parlez-vous maintenant plus couramment l'autre langue officielle qu'avant?
1) oui
2) non _____

b) possédez-vous une connaissance pratique de l'autre langue officielle?
1) oui
2) non _____

10) Katimavik est-il bien accepté par les citadins?
1) oui
2) sans opinion
3) non

11) Certains membres du personnel de terrain ont-ils quitté volontairement votre projet? Combien? (0, 1, etc.)

12) Certains membres du personnel de terrain ont-ils été renvoyés?
1) oui
2) non

Si oui: était-ce raisonnable?
1) oui
2) non

13) Travailleriez-vous encore pour Katimavik dans l'avenir?
1) oui
2) non

14) Recommanderiez-vous le programme Katimavik à un(e) ami(e) plus jeune en tant que participant(e)?
1) oui
2) non

15) Recommanderiez-vous le travail d'agent de groupe ou de coordinateur à un(e) ami(e)?
1) oui
2) non

16) Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît le mieux dans Katimavik?

17) Qu'est-ce que vous aimez le moins?

18) Quelle est la chose la plus importante que vous ayez acquise à Katimavik?

ASK

19) Le bureau régional vous apporte-t-il tout le soutien dont vous ayez besoin?
1) oui
2) non

SI NON: Expliquez _____

20) Le bureau national vous apporte-t-il tout le soutien dont vous ayez besoin?
1) oui
2) non

21) Les documents fournis par le bureau national sont-ils adéquats?
1) excellent
2) assez bon
3) bon
4) mauvais

22) Le promoteur fournit-il un soutien en équipement adequat pour ce projet?
1) oui
2) non

SI NON: Expliquez _____

23) Quel équipement Katimavik doit-il fournir pour le projet de travail?
1) autobus
2) camion
3) autre
4) rien

24) Etes-vous satisfait des participants?
1) oui
2) non

SI NON: Expliquez _____

25) Etes-vous satisfait en général des projets?
1) oui
2) non

SI NON: Expliquez _____

26) Etes-vous satisfait du soutien des autres membres du personnel de terrain?
1) oui
2) non

SI NON: Expliquez _____

27) Si vous avez travaillé avec Katimavik pendant plus d'une année, classez ces années (première, deuxième, etc.) d'après leur efficacité globale.
1977 - 1978
1978 - 1979
1979 - 1980
1980 - 1981

28) Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada devrait financer des programmes comme Katimavik?
1) oui
2) non

Pourquoi oui ou pourquoi non? _____

29) Age

30) Sexe
1) masculin
2) féminin

31) Etes-vous diplômé(e) de l'école secondaire ou du Cegep?
1) oui
2) non

32) Avez-vous fréquenté l'université?
1) oui
2) non

33) Etes-vous originaire d'une grande ville, d'une petite ville, ou d'une communauté rurale?
1) grande ville
2) petite ville
3) environnement rural

34) De quelle région êtes-vous originaire?
1) C.-B. ou Yukon
2) Prairies
3) Ontario
4) Québec
5) Atlantique

35) Dans quelle région travaillez-vous?
1) C.-B. ou Yukon
2) Prairies
3) Ontario
4) Québec
5) Atlantique

36) Quel est le poste le plus important à Katimavik à part celui de personnel détaché?

37) Etes-vous un
1) agent de groupe
2) coordonateur

38) En pensant encore aux participants, quel est le pourcentage, croyez-vous, qui ont appris plus de choses et qui ont mieux compris le Canada, à cause de Katimavik?

1) Tous
2) 75%
3) 50%
4) 25%
5) aucun

39) Katimavik veut aider au développement personnel des participants. Quel est le pourcentage de participants, croyez-vous, qui se sont développés personnellement?

1) Tous
2) 75%
3) 50%
4) 25%
5) aucun

40) Un des buts de Katimavik est d'augmenter la compétence dans la langue seconde. Quel est le pourcentage des participants qui ont développé leurs connaissances et aptitudes linguistiques de façon significative pendant leur participation à Katimavik?

1) Tous
2) 75%
3) 50%
4) 25%
5) aucun

41) Considérant les buts de Katimavik comme un tout, quel est le pourcentage des participants qui ont profité des buts de ce programme?

1) Tous
2) 75%
3) 50%
4) 25%
5) aucun

42) Si un(e) participant(e) a quitté votre groupe, veuillez prendre un instant pour en considérer la raison. Veuillez le (la) comparer au reste du groupe, spécialement en ce qui a trait à sa capacité de profiter de Katimavik.

_____

_____

_____

_____

43) Si un(e) participant(e) a été congédié(e) de votre groupe, veuillez prendre un instant pour en considérer la raison. Veuillez le (la) comparer au reste du groupe, spécialement en ce qui a trait à sa capacité de profiter de Katimavik.

_____

_____

_____

_____

BIN *B22285

J

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

EFFICACITE

1) Quand faisiez-vous partie de Katimavik?
1) 1977 - 1978 ____
2) 1978 - 1979 ____
3) 1979 - 1980 ____
4) 1980 - 1981 ____

2) Quelle a été la meilleure année, en termes d'efficacité du programme?
1) 1977 - 1978 ____
2) 1978 - 1979 ____
3) 1979 - 1980 ____
4) 1980 - 1981 ____

3) Quelle année vient en deuxième position? ____

4) Quelle année vient en troisième position? ____

5) SI PERSONNEL REGIONAL: Qu'est-ce que le bureau national a fait pour vous récemment? ____

Que devraient-ils faire? ____

Que pourraient-ils faire? ____

Faites le même genre de commentaire au sujet du personnel de terrain de votre région. ____

Comment pourrait-on améliorer le fonctionnement de votre bureau? ____

6) SI PERSONNEL NATIONAL: Etes-vous satisfait(e) de ce que font les bureaux régionaux?
1) oui
2) non ____

Que devraient-ils faire? ____

Que pourraient-ils faire? ____

Comment pourrait-on améliorer le fonctionnement de votre bureau ou département? ____

7) Comment pourrait-on améliorer Katimavik? ____

8) Aimez-vous travailler à CFCAN?
1) oui
2) non ____

9) Vos conditions de travail, etc., sont-elles acceptables?

1) oui
2) non

Commentaires: _____

10) Examinez vos relations avec les promoteurs. Comment pourrait-on les améliorer? _____

11) Comment pourrait-on améliorer les projets eux-mêmes? _____

12) Beaucoup de promoteurs pleins d'espoir soumettent des propositions qui ne sont pas acceptées. Comment en acceptent-ils la nouvelle?

1) de bonne grâce
2) avec indifférence
3) de mauvaise grâce

Que faites-vous pour atténuer leur déception? _____

13) Katimavik est-il bien accepté par les citoyens des communautés? _____

14) Quel est le concept Katimavik? _____

15) Comment pourrait-on mettre le programme Katimavik en meilleure harmonie avec le concept Katimavik? _____

16) Pensez-vous que Katimavik atteint ses objectifs? Développement personnel, etc.?

1) oui
2) non

Commentaires: _____

17) Ces objectifs sont-ils importants?

1) oui
2) non

18) Existe-t-il d'autres aspects de Katimavik qui vous rendent la vie inutilement difficile?

1) oui
2) non

19) Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada devrait continuer à financer des programmes comme Katimavik?

1) oui, absolument
2) oui
3) non
4) non, absolument

20) Dans quel bureau travaillez-vous?

1) national
2) région de la C.-B. et du Yukon
3) région des Prairies
4) région de l'Ontario
5) région du Québec
6) région de l'Atlantique

MERCI

BIN #22285 K

NOTE: 1) Cette étude se fait sous l'égide du Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but d'évaluer le programme Katimavik, suite à la demande du Cabinet du gouvernement du Canada.

2) La participation à cette étude se fait à titre volontaire.

SECTION COUTS ET BENEFICES

Nous espérons que vous allez soulever des points intéressants que nous pourrons utiliser pour notre analyse économique. Veuillez répondre à ces questions dans cet esprit.

1) A votre avis, y a-t-il maintenant des politiques qui aboutissent à un gaspillage d'argent? Ex: est-ce que vous louez à bail des articles pendant de longues périodes, et finissez par payer plus cher que le prix de détail?

2) Qui est responsable de ces politiques? Ex: le régional ou le national?

3) Dans le passé, y a-t-il eu d'autres politiques qui ont causé un gaspillage d'argent?

4) Supposez que le ciel vous sourie, et que vous ayez un petit peu plus d'argent. Que pourriez-vous accomplir avec une petite augmentation (de disons 10%) de votre budget? Soyez précis sur ce que vous feriez et sur ce que cela coûterait.

5) Supposez maintenant que votra budget soit réduit de 10%. Que réduiriez-vous et combien chaque réduction économiserait-elle? Quel en serait l'impact sur votr projet?

_____

_____

_____

6) Et maintenant, supposez que vous obteniez une augmentation budgétaire de 50%. Comment spécifiquement, la dépenseriez-vous et que voudriez-vous accomplir avec?

_____

_____

_____

7) D'une façon moins hypothétique, pourrait-on augmenter le nombre de participants sans beaucoup augmenter les coûts globaux? Si oui, comment?

_____

_____

_____

8) De même, pourrait-on réaliser plus pleinement les objectifs de Katimavik (service communautaire, développement personnel, conscience de l'environnement, accroissement de la compréhension des autres) sans beaucoup augmenter les coûts? Si oui, comment?

_____

_____

_____

Merci de vos réflexions.